

A  
V I E W  
OF THE  
T I M E S,  
THEIR  
PRINCIPLES and PRACTICES  
IN THE  
R E H E A R S A L S.

---

V O L. V.

---

By PHILALETHES.

---

*Qui bene latuit.*———

---

The SECOND EDITION.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for W. BOWEN, near St. Paul's,

MDCCL.

W E I V

R E M I T



2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1000000

# T H E P R E F A C E

## C O N T A I N S,

1. *The parting of the Rehearſal and his countryman; and the paſſing-bell. The enemies the Rehearſal has made to himſelf by theſe papers; with his contempt of them for their getting his paper ſtopped after he had done his worſt. He deſcribes the reign of Belial and Beelzebub, and triumphs over them.*
2. *He compleats what he had more to ſay againſt the book of the Rights, in answer to its ſecond and laſt Defence, which makes it more abhorrent than ever.*
3. *An account of a tract of Húgo Grotius, of Mr. Hales, and of a quotation they bring of Mr. Hooker's, which they have annexed to this ſecond Defence.*
4. *The Heathens allowed more authority to their elective Gods, than the men of the Rights to the great God himſelf.*

1. **R** Ehearſal. Come, countryman, ſince this is the laſt time you and I am like to meet in haſte, let us talk over a Preface to this volume, that it may appear like the reſt, and not look like a cow without horns.

C. *My Heart is ſo full I cannot ſpeak——Muſt I part with my dear maſter?——When ſhall I get ſuch another?*

A 2

R. Do

R. *Do not blubber and cry like a Child. I thought you had more mettle in you. You know my rule, every thing that happens is best; therefore merry meet, merry part.*

C. *I shall never be merry more: I will go and bid them toll the bell for you.*

R. *Why? I am not dead yet.*

C. *Our parson makes the bell toll before folks are dead, for which some call him a papist; for they say the papishes when they hear that bell, fall down on their knees, and pray for the soul departing.*

R. *And if we pray at all, it is for the soul departed; for the bell does not give notice sooner.*

*I proposed several times, countryman, to have talked with you upon this subject, and endeavour to get this reformed, as in your parish; but other things came in the way, and I thought I had time enough; but I am cut short from this, as well as many other things.*

C. *Ah, master, I should be satisfied if I did but know the reason of this. What have you done? Why is your paper singled out to be suppressed?*

R. *Because it was worth it — Can you see no enemies I have made to myself by it?*

C. *O this simple head of mine. I thought no body could be offended at it. I knew many were pleased, and think the Coffee-house now a dull place, since the Rehearsal lies upon the table no more.*

*But now I think on it, it is a greater wonder it has lasted so long, than that it should now be put down. For whom have you attacked, or whom have you not attacked! The Atheists, the Deists, the Socinians, the Papists, Presbyterians, Predestinarians, and sectaries of all sorts, the rebels, whigs, and traitors, which are most of all. There is a looking-glass for every one of them in your Rehearsals, and they could not bear the sight.* They

## THE PREFACE.

*They struggled hard to answer you, and threw dirt in abundance; but they could not touch you, only besmeared themselves. In their rage they blasphemed and ridiculed the holy scriptures (because they supported you) calling them dry Hebrew roots and withered branches. And they were exasperated beyond measure, because the laws of the land were on your side, and condemned all coercion over the crown, which you have made as clear as the sun at noon-day, even to the utter silencing of them, that they had not a word more to say! And upon the point of reason, you have made a perfect fool of the power of the people, and the independent state of nature (their great foundation) that it is become the jest of the town, and every boy can laugh it to death, and see through the senseless blunders of Milton, Lock, Sidney, and all their late celebrated heroes upon this argument. They were yesterday the idols of the people, and were worshipped while they were set up on high; but you have pulled them down, and now, like other broken idols, they are kicked about the streets, and thrown into the kennel. The Review, their strenuous assertor, has been forced to deliver them all up into your hands, as prisoners at discretion, after he had fought their battle to the last man through every starting-hole; he was at last obliged to own that their scheme would not hold, and to give up the power of the people.*

*You have not only disproved them, but triumphed over them, and dragged their principles at the wheels of their chariot a spectacle to the world, that no man has since dared to name the independent state and power of the people, they are rendered so ridiculous, and so plainly as to be obvious to any one that can reckon his fingers!*

*And they are now tormented that they have held on the dispute with you so long as to give you an opportunity for so complete a victory!*

*R. And their getting me stopped now in the manner they did, serves only to proclaim their defeat, and the weakness of their cause. I had just roasted their puffs of a commonwealth, and left her squeeking when her eyes were dropping out; O patriots! patriots! (to those who had spitted her) and O dear liberty and property! (with which they basted her.) At that word they cried stop ——— We can never endure it ——— But they had e'en as good have let me dish her up; for I had just done with her: They should have begun sooner, or not have begun now.*

*C. They did begin sooner, even from the beginning, these now almost five years since you set out they have been hunting the government upon you, and wondered they could not reach you; they said you were shot-free, and that some invisible power protected you, that you single could stand in the gap so long against all these armies of the Philistines! And they had not power to touch you till you had perfected your work; which will remain, and do good to after-generations, as it has in this most corrupt and degenerate age; at least it will shew, that the corruption was not universal, but that there were some,*

*Who, Noah-like, in bad times durst be good,  
And the stiff torrent manfully withstood.*

*R. And this shameful way they have taken of stopping my mouth when argument failed (which they complained of in others) will perpetuate their guilt, and confound their principles more than all I had afterwards to say. Thus Samson slew more at his death than in all his life.*

*C. But*

## The P R E F A C E.

vi;

*C. But do you compare yourself to Samson, though they made you the Samson of the party? Will not this be thought vapouring in you?*

*R. I do it on purpose; I vapoured and insulted over them before, to provoke them to answer. And I do it now to shew that they have not answered; and I will boldly say, they never can. For the principles I have laid down are scripture, law, and reason, and will last as long. And all the devils of hell will never be able to root up the seed I have sown in England, of the original, the deduction, and obligation of government, of monarchy and loyalty. And the Rehearsals will for ever remain an antidote against all the lewd harangues of Belial and Beelzebub, the gods of liberty, and the voice of the people. In whose reign of anarchy,*

*Omnia vulgus erat, scelerisque licentia vulgo.*

*But I have exorcis'd these devils.*

*Et tandem vulgus desinet esse Deus.*

*2. C. We have out-done Jeroboam: He took his priests from the mob, and his gods from their calves. But we have set the beasts of the people above God himself! You have been put to defend the Almighty! And, which is more strange, have been beaten in this cause! You long defended the ordinance of God, till at last they blasphemed against God himself! And made good, even literally, the argument you enforced, that to resist his ordinance was to resist himself; and that there was no other way by which either Lucifer or we, did or could resist God.*

*But, master, there is a Second Defence of the book of the Rights come out; and now as a parting conference I would desire you to give me your thoughts upon it. May be they have retracted, at least endeavoured*

*voured to extenuate these horrid things you have charged upon them out of the book, and the first Defence of it.*

*R. That was reasonably to be expected; and if they had made any excuses, or put a softer sense upon their words, I was resolved to let them escape as easily as I could. So the truth were established, let their former errors be forgotten; but, countryman, the case is quite otherwise; for in this Second Defence they quote the Rehearfals, own the charge against them, and stand by it, and justify it. And whereas before they only asserted, that God had his authority from the people, they now argue it at length, and take pains to prove it, beginning at p. 37. of the Second Defence. And they tell you, p. 38. that this election of God by the people was a fair and free election, there being not so much as one negative in the whole congregation.*

*C. Then it was nemine contradicente — But might they not recal these votes again, and as they voted him in to be their king, might they not vote him out again, as they do with earthly kings? Did they not reserve to themselves the right to judge of his administration, and when he had broke the original contract, and so had forfeited his crown?*

*R. Yes, countryman, they hold all this, as you may see, p. 41. where they tell how God did govern during the theocracy, till the Jews rejected him from being their king, or unvoted him of his kingdom.*

*C. This is full to the point indeed! But let me see the book myself, let me read it — There it is, unvoted him of his kingdom. Shall I believe my eyes! unvoted him of his kingdom — The great God to be dethroned by mortal man! But I will refrain my indignation till I have asked you all the questions I can about it, that we may see which way they take to support*

*support this monstrous nonsense, and most outrageous blasphemy! First therefore let me know how they prove, that the people did chuse God to be their king?*

*R. The commandments which God gave them in Horeb, the men of the Rights call proposals on God's part; but that they were not laws to the people till their consent gave the sanction to them! And they say, p. 38. that Moses was chosen to transact this affair between him (God) and them (the people.) And accordingly he (Moses) goes from the Lord with a proposal to the people, which was for them to become a kingdom unto him, and consequently for him to become their king. To which proposal, after the people had expressly agreed, there not being so much as one negative in the whole congregation; then he returns to the Lord from the people, and in their behalf gives the Lord the very words by which they had expressed their consent to his proposal.*

*C. You shall not for shame answer them, master; for surely I, or any that ever read the Bible, can see through the folly, as well as madness, of this vile stuff! God commanded them with majesty and terror; they trembled, and promised intire obedience. And this these sots call driving a bargain, making proposals (forsooth) and transacting this affair!*

*It is infinite condescension and goodness in God to make a covenant with us; but we have seen men take upon them to make a covenant with God, and tie him down to their terms! And he shall be no longer their King, or their God, than he performs punctually what they have laid upon him, of which they are still the judges!*

*R. And thus they did judge: They thought God negligent in his office, in not relieving Jabeesh-Gilead, 1 Sam. xi. and xii. 12. Therefore they rejected him from being their king; which is the proof the men of*

*the Rights bring to shew the authority of the people!*

C. *The wickedness of the people, they should have said; but not so great as their own, in arguing from hence the right and authority of the people to depose their God! They might have done foolishly in rejecting God from being their king: But they had not done wickedly, if they had just right and authority so to do. Yet God calls it a great sin in them, and threatens them severely for it. And what right had he to do that, if he was abdicated by those who had authority to do it! By those to whose votes he owed his kingdom, and therefore he ought to have submitted patiently to their unvoting him again; for they had as much right to do the one as the other! But do the men of the Rights say, that God was no longer their king, after they had thus unvoted him?*

R. *Yes; for in the very next words following (p. 41.) they say, that God reigned over the Jews with their own consent, and no longer than they consented. The same is repeated twice in p. 37. again p. 50. and frequently.*

C. *Then he could not be their king again without a new election; so that their Horeb-contract was at an end. And they must shew some other, or else confess, that God did reign over them whether they would or not; for it is most certain, that he did reign over the Jews after this supposed abdication. He set kings over them, as David, Solomon, &c. He punished them often, and at last destroyed their city and temple, and sold them into captivity. Now the men of the Rights are obliged to call this usurpation and tyranny in God, if he was not then their King.*

R. *No, countryman, they have a distinction for that; they say, p. 48. That the grand cause of mistake is not considering when God acts as governor of the universe, and when he acts as prince of a par-*

particular nation. *And again, p. 49. in applying what the Rights say of God's civil empire over the Jews, which he exercised but for a while, to his natural and eternal empire over mankind, which he will and must exercise to all eternity.*

*C. It is true, that God did govern the Jews in a more particular manner, and more immediately than any other nation. But this was wholly an act of grace and favour in God. Nor was their consent asked to this any otherwise than as they were obliged to consent to whatever he commanded, and to obey with all readiness; not to canvass and dispute, or drive a bargain, or put it to the vote, as the Rights stupidly fancy, and make a ridiculous scene! and totally inconsistent with the majesty of God! That if he pleased to take any one nation into his own more immediate government, he could not do it without their consent, but must derive his kingship from their vote and authority! and be liable to be unvoted or deposed by them! This is all the hideous blasphemy you have called it; for the natural and universal empire of God is not to be separated from his empire of any particular country; therefore we find that he commanded the Jews in the stile of their God and Creator, though they were his peculiar people, and when he calls himself their king, he means the same as their God. And to say they could unking him, is the same as to say they could ungod him. It is true, they rejected him from being their God. Was he therefore no more their King or their God? The men of the Rights have rejected him from being their king, or their God, while they deny he has authority to govern any nation, or give them laws without their own consent!*

*R. They say, p. 41, 42. that God, by the law of nature, having allowed mankind a right of chusing their own governors, would not as king deprive them*

them of that right which he had before as God, given them in common with the rest of mankind.

C. *It was ridiculous in the Rights to say this to you, whom they often quote, and pretend to answer, without offering something against those arguments (I think invincible) by which you have proved, that God never gave any such right to mankind, but that the first man that ever was born, was born in subjection, and so all that came after. And that the supposed independent state of mankind is contrary to the law of nature, as well as to the institution of God: Both which you have proved to a demonstration. And you then told them, that their scheme of government would naturally lead them into this very blasphemy of setting the people at last above God himself!*

R. *To confirm their argument the stronger, they tell you here, p. 41. That God would not reign over the Jews till they had agreed to the covenant he proposed to them by Moses. And in the first Defence, p. 24. they say, that God was chosen to be their king by the express consent of all the people (at Horeb) before he gave them any political laws.*

C. *Was not circumcision a political law? And was not the passover such, with the dedication of the first-born, and commanded to be observed throughout all their generations? And these were long before the supposed Horeb-contract, and many other commandments which God gave to the Jews before that time.*

R. *They will say, that God gave these commands as universal king of the world, upon the account of his Godhead, but not as particular king of the Jews, and chosen by their own consent.*

C. *Were not these laws given to the Jews as God's peculiar people? They were not given to any other nation. So that God did chuse them to be his people, not they him to be their king. He was their king, and they*

*they his people, before that contract which is stupidly imagined they made with him at Horeb. He gave them laws before, which were as much their national laws as any he gave them after; let the men of the Rights shew the difference.*

*R. But they say, we are not to argue from the particular laws given to the Jews, and which bound them only to the laws and customs of any other nation, which was not put under those laws.*

*C. That is true in many cases; but the reason of the Rights is ridiculous as well as blasphemous, that this was on account of the Jews choosing God to be their king; and that he thenceforward acted by an authority which he derived from them!*

*R. Yet the Rights bring in this matter of the Jews, and their senseless notion of the Horeb-contract on purpose to apply it, and draw an argument from thence to the diminution of the church of Christ; for having said in the first Defence, p. 25, that the crime of Korah, &c. was in opposing the high-priest among the Jews, made by (God) their king by an authority derived from the people. The inference is made in the next words: And one would think no clergyman ought to take that title as an affront, or open insult on the order, which God was pleased to accept for his kingship over the Jewish nation.*

*C. Sr. Jude applies the gainsaying of Korah to those who separate themselves in the Christian church, ver. 11, and 19. but the inference will not hold by any means according to the Rights, unless it appear that Christ, the king of the Christian church, was chosen by the unanimous vote of the people, as they say God was at Horeb; or that God sent Christ into the world by an authority derived to him from the people!*

*R. Christ had but a few to follow him, nor was he chosen even by these; for he said to them, Ye have not  
chosen*

chosen me, but I have chosen you, *John xv. 16.* And he was condemned by the voices of the people, *Luke xxiii. 23.* Therefore, whatever becomes of the Jewish priesthood, the Rights cannot say, that the Christian priesthood was ordained by their king, by an authority derived from the people; for they said of him, We will not have this man to reign over us.

C. Thus their blasphemy serves them in no stead, and their putting God under the feet of the people of the Jews, which was contrived by them on purpose to bring the Christian priesthood likewise to be originally derived from the people, and ultimately resolved into them, has turned directly against them, and made them blaspheme for nothing, but to let their wickedness be known to the world, and their inveterate rancour at the church of Christ, while we see them rake into hell, and inspired from thence to find objections against her, and attempt to pull God out of his throne in heaven, that they may deface his church upon earth. But she has the promise that hell shall not prevail against her; and this is the boldest attack ever made out of those gates! But, blessed be God, who has made you triumph over them, and sent back these principles to the place from whence they came.

For my part, I desire no other answer to the book of the Rights; for here is the whole. If God made kings and priests, then they are the anointed of God, the kings and priests of God, and not of the people; they are superior to the people, and the people are subject unto them. And it not being time of day yet for the men of the Rights to disown the holy scriptures, which plainly tell us, that God did make kings and priests; there was no other way left them to bring kings and priests under the feet of the people, but to make God himself derive his authority from the people. I think that you having now abundantly exposed

posed their Horeb-contract, in answer to this their Second and last Defence of it, I see no need of more. To go through all the mad consequences they draw from this blasphemous scheme, (which might fill volumes) would be to kill a man after his head was off.

3. But, master, they have added to this Second Defence two tracts of Hugo Grotius: 1. *Whether the sacrament of the Lord's supper may not be administered where there are no pastors?* 2. *Whether it be necessary at all times to communicate with the symbols?* As likewise several tracts of Mr. John Hales concerning the sacrament, the power of the keys, and of schism. And an Appendix with one short quotation out of Mr. Hooker in favour of the Horeb-contract. Now what shall I say to these? None of them seem to meddle with our present subject, except the last.

R. The last is of no authority, being taken out of the viiiith book of Mr. Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, which was posthumous, and not supposed to be his, at least that it was so interpolated, that we cannot be sure what part of it is his.

In the next place, what is there quoted has not a word of God's deriving his kingship from the people, but only that he had their consent to the laws he imposed upon them by the hands of Moses; and it mentions not a word of Horeb, or any supposed contract made there; but refers equally to all the laws of Moses, the passover, and other laws made before the supposed Horeb-contract, as well as what followed.

The other tracts are attacks upon the church on another side; and have been answered, Mr. Hales by the reverend Mr. Long of Exeter, printed 1678. And Mr. Dodwell has wrote a learned Dissertation upon that of Grotius, printed 1685. But Grotius has vindicated himself, and denies that book, as printed, to be his; for Andreas Rivetus, in his Animadversiones  
ad

ad Cassandri consultationem de religione ab H. Grotio editam: *And in his Apologeticus pro suo de veræ Pacis Ecclesiæ proposito contra H. Groelii Votum, had taxed Grotius to be the author of the little Dissertation, De Cœnæ Administratione ubi pastores non sunt, &c. to which Dionysius Petavius had published an answer. But H. Grotius, in his answer to Rivet, has fully vindicated himself; for in his Votum pro Pace Ecclesiastica, p. 658. he saith, Libellus iste, cui respondit reverendus Petavius, cujus sit auctoris nihil refert, ego eum totum pro meo non agnosco; that is, he did not own it all to be his. And in p. 694. of his Rivetiani Apologetici discussio, he thus replies to Rivet, Libellum illum cui vir reverendus Dionysius Petavius respondit merito pro suo non agnoscit Grotius: Nam & addita sunt quæ Grotius nec scripsit nec probat, & quæ ab ipso congesta erant, eo erant tempore congesta, quo disputatio ista collebat inter reverendissimum episcopum Aurelianensem, & virum amplissimum Nicolaum Rigaltium, non animo quicquam defendendi, sed inquirendi eruditorum sententias; that is, that Grotius did justly deny that book to be his, because many things were added which Grotius neither wrote nor approved; and that what he had gathered upon that subject was on occasion of a dispute then on foot betwixt two eminent persons, but not with intention to defend either side, but to inquire after the opinion of learned men. What I have quoted is to be found in the third tome of his Theological Works, printed at Amsterdam, 1679.*

*C. This is cheating and playing tricks — To quote books put upon authors, and to take no notice of their being already answered; but the cause of the Rights needs such helps as these! And you have now made roo and branch work with the book of the Rights.*

4. R. *I have fought with worse beasts than St. Paul at Ephesus, when he preached down their Diana; for though they worshipped false Gods, and of their own setting up, yet they durst not assert in plain terms, that their gods did derive their power from them, because they chose them, and changed them at their pleasure, and every nation, and city, and family, and private person too, had each their own tutelar god and genius, whom they chose out of the vast number of their gods; yet they thought not that this gave them authority over their gods, to make themselves the supreme, and their gods to act by an authority delegated from them; for then the gods should have worshipped the people, instead of the people worshipping their gods; for which is superior, he that delegates a power to another, or he to whom the power is delegated? He that gives, or he that receives? He that makes, or he that is made?*

C. *It seems to me, that these men of the Rights have had in their eye these elective gods of the heathen, when they dreamed of the Horeb-contract. But the heathen will rise up in the judgment, and condemn them; for the heathen did not so prostitute their false gods as these men have the great God of heaven and earth, by pulling him down, and putting him under the feet of the beasts of the people!*

R. *And who would think that this has been one of the hardest tasks I have undergone, to justify the supremacy of God! And that some think it is not yet done, nor a sufficient answer given to the book of the Rights!*

*But this I have gained by it, that they cannot put the king under the people, nor make him accountable to them, any otherwise than they make God himself to be so. This they acknowledge by putting both upon the same foot; that is, the election of the people. And they have fully justified what I told them from the be-*  
a
ginning,

*ginning, that their principles would lead them even to this! And they have made it good. So that the word is now, for God and the king, or for the people. And if I have gained the victory for God, I have for the king too; for if God was not chosen by the people, then the king is God's king, and not the people's, he is the anointed of God, and not of the people; he derives his authority from God, and not from the people. And the Rights own all this to be true, unless they can prove, that God himself did derive his authority from the people. This is the issue to which these ingenious men have brought the dispute of government! I forced them to it; they had no other way to escape me. And though I told them beforehand, that I would drive them to this, yet they could not avoid it; nor can any who would make the people the original of government.*

*And now may not I triumph? I could not bring them to a greater or more monstrous absurdity, if they had let me talk on with them all the days of my life; so that they have stooped me too late. And I may now say, in reference to the whole club of the orators for the power of the people, to Kit-cat, and this their celebrated book of the Rights, the great bull of Bashan, I have given him a parting blow.*

*Jamque opus exegi, quod nec bovis ira nec ignes;  
Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas.*

*And in spite of all they have done, and all that they can do, they will never be able to hinder, but that still to their mortification,*

*Ore legar populi* —

# THE REHEARSAL.

---

Wednesday, March 24, 1707. No. 503.

---

1. The instance found out by the *Review* of God's approving taking *arms* against tyrants.
2. The *Review's* *Heathen-Christian* times.
3. His blasphemous *insulting* of God. The book of the *Rights* as *senseless* as it is *impious*.
4. The *people* did not accuse *Rehoboam* but *Solomon* of *tyranny*.
5. God did not *order* the *ten tribes* to *resist*. Their *resistance* was a *rebellion*.
6. Why God would not prosper *Rehoboam*. But his *son* revenged his quarrel. The *judgments* upon the *ten tribes*.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Review* has at last found out that upon which you, *master*, have so much pressed him, that is, an instance where God did approve of *subjects* taking *arms* against their *princes*, which he has asserted to have been the practice of God in all ages, yet cannot find one example of it. But now he has found it! and in his of the 16th instant he thus accosts you,

“ Mark that, Mr. *Rebearsal*, from the time that God  
 “ ordered the *ten tribes* to resist the arbitrary government  
 “ of his own anointed tyrant *Rehoboam*; even to the  
 “ late revolution, history is full of it; and every nation  
 VOL. V. B “ in

" in the Christian part of the world, even in heathen times, have practised it."

2. R. What does he mean by *heathen times*? when there were *heathens* in the world? or when the *Christians* were *heathens*? and *even* in *heathen times*? what's that? was that in *better times*, or in *worse times*? he would not bring us examples out of the *worst* of times for us to follow! but did *Christians* take arms against *even* their *heathen kings*? that was an *aggravation* indeed! then much more might they have done against their *Christian kings*!

C. The *Review* writes by the *ear*, from the *sound* not the *sense*——*Even in heathen times*——It runs well, and is *smooth*——He had heard this saying often used by the *passive obedience men*, that God would not allow *subjects* to take arms against their *kings*, *even in heathen times*, against a *Pharaoh*, an *Abasuerus*, &c. and therefore that God did far less allow it against a *Christian king*. It was a fine *simile*, but *Bays* knew not how to *apply* it; he turns it quite the contrary way, and points it directly against himself!

But, *master*, what do you say to his argument? that God ordered the *ten tribes* to *resist* the arbitrary government of his own anointed tyrant?

3. R. If he had the due reward of *blasphemy* he would get the *answer* he deserves! but see how he dares presume to *insult* and *ridicule* the *Almighty*!

All I have to do, is to endeavour to save people that are too easily *infected*, by detecting as well the *folly* as the horrid *impiety* of those *principles* he has undertaken to defend; therefore I will go with him a little upon the now modish *topicks* that are set up. And since he makes a *jest* of the *authority* of God, I'll bring him to that he values much more, that is, the *authority* of the *people*! The book of the *Rights* (as I have before quoted it) makes the sin of *Korah* to consist in opposing a *high-priest* whom God had set over them, by an *authority* derived to him from the *people*. Now, Mr. *Review*, might not God, by virtue of the *Horeb-contract*,  
I place

place a king over them as well as a priest? You say, that God makes no king otherwise but by the people: therefore kings are more properly the anointed of the people than of God, since the people are the ultimate and foundation authority, from which the right that God has to make kings is derived! So that Rehoboam was, by this, the people's own anointed tyrant, this being long after the Horeb-contract! And you have blasphemed and ridiculed the sovereign and super-almighty power of the people, from whom the derivative-almighty power of God receives his authority!

C. It chills my blood to hear such hideous and senseless blasphemy! it is enough to bring down fire and brimstone upon the nation where it is suffered! of which it is not a small sign, that this book of the Rights, and all who defend it, are not an execration to all good men, and the laughing-stock of all men of sense.

But now, master, as to the argument of Mr. Review, what was this tyranny of Rehoboam which is the instance he has chosen to shew, that God did approve of subjects taking arms against their king?

4. R. There was not one tittle of tyranny objected by the people against Rehoboam; all their complaint was against the glorious reign of his father king Solomon, the wisest of all mankind, who encouraged trade, and made silver as stones for plenty in Jerusalem. He made them rich and great, and all the nations round about them were tributaries to them. This shews when some people will be contented! they complained that his yoke was grievous! but who are they that complained? a company of giddy people, stirred up to mutiny by a designing and ambitious rebel, who usurped the government to himself, which shewed, according to the signification of his name, the folly of the people. And this complaint of grievances was made to Rehoboam just as he came to the crown, and before he had done any one act of government either good or evil.

C. This Review is very unlucky in his instances; this of Rehoboam is quite out of the way. But what say

you to what he asserts, *That God ordered the ten tribes to resist the arbitrary government of Rehoboam?*

5. R. If there was no *arbitrary government*, there could be no *order* to *resist* it. But I desire Mr. Review to shew that *order* of God to the *ten tribes* to *resist*; it was of this *revolution* that God said, *They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not*, Hof. viii. 4. Did God then *order* it, or *approve* it? Let Mr. Review read Num. 77, of my first *Volume*, and then see whether *Jeroboam* was justified by God, and whether the *defection* of the *ten tribes* caused by him was not a *rebellion*? Let him read 2 Chr. xiii. from ver. 4. and there he will see the fault both of *Rehoboam* and *Jeroboam*.

“ And *Abijah* stood up——and said—Hear thou  
 “ *Jeroboam*, and all *Israel*, ought ye not to know that  
 “ the Lord God of *Israel* gave the kingdom over *Israel*  
 “ to *David* for ever, even to him and to his sons by a  
 “ covenant of salt? Yet *Jeroboam*, the son of *Nebat*,  
 “ the servant of *Solomon*, the son of *David*, is risen up,  
 “ and hath rebelled against his Lord; and there are ga-  
 “ thered unto him vain men, the children of *Belial*,  
 “ and have strengthened themselves against *Rehoboam*,  
 “ the son of *Solomon*, when *Rehoboam* was young and  
 “ tender hearted, and could not withstand them.”

C. Here is the fault or rather *misfortune* of *Rehoboam*. He was *young* and *tender-hearted*, and not able to withstand the conspiracy of *Jeroboam*, who had *lift up his hand* against the king his father; but *Solomon* was too wise to suffer him to stay in the land. But young *Rehoboam* did not mind this, and let him return, thinking, perhaps, that a *rebel* might *repent*! This was the *tender-hearted tyrant*! A pretty instance of *tyranny* the Review has found out! but the *conspiracy* of *Jeroboam* is here called *rebellion* against the *hereditary right* of the *sons of David*, and the *ten tribes*, who joined with him, are called children of *Belial*, that is, of *liberty*, as you have before instructed me.

## The REHEARSAL.

5

6. R. The weakness of *Rehoboam* betrayed him likewise into *idolatry*; for which reason *God* did frustrate all the attempts he made to recover his *kingdom*. But he gave him a son (*Abijah*) who did revenge his quarrel, and slew 600,000 of the *Israelites* in one battle, and said to them before they fought, *Now ye think to withstand the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David*. — Neither did *Jeroboam* recover strength again in the days of *Abijah*. And the Lord struck him, and he died. This was the end of the man who made *Israel* to sin, who broke in upon the hereditary succession, and set up an elective kingdom in the ten tribes, who, in the course of nineteen kings, had not one good, though all of their own choosing, except *Jehu* whom *God* raised up to scourge their wickedness; and at last they were carried away captive, and lost off the face of the earth. All the *Jews* now known in the world being of the two loyal tribes, who adhered to their king, and the hereditary succession of the crown of *Israel*.

---

 Saturday, March 7, 1707.

 N<sup>o</sup> 309.
 

---

1. The *Review* knows not where to find a *tyrant*.
2. Why the mildest *princes* are generally called *tyrants*.
3. The case of *Zedekiah* and *Jeremiah*.
4. The obligation of *oaths*.
5. Of the unlawful *oaths*.
6. The argument of the *Review* against the right of the late king *James* to succeed to the *crown*.
7. Contrary to the *presbyterian confession of faith*, which contradicts the *revolution-acts of parliament*.
8. The *Review* must be either a *blockhead*, or a *Jacobite* in *masquerade*.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Review* will be mortified for his instance of *Rehoboam*. If he had called him a *fool* he might have had something to say, but to make a *tyrant* of him, who was so *tender-hearted* as not to resist a *rebellion*, shews Mr. *De Foe* did not know where to find a *tyrant*.

2. R. It is the too common fate of *tender-hearted princes* to be called *tyrants*; and the reason is, that this often betrays them to the designs of *ambitious* and *rebellious subjects*; and whoever destroy their king are sure to call him a *tyrant*, to justify their own *rebellion*. Thus king *Char. I.* was made a *tyrant*, for he was too *tender-hearted* to withstand those *sons of Belial* who rose up against him. He let them grow upon him, till at last he was not able to withstand them, and was forced to say to them concerning the *church* he had defended, as *Zedekiah* said to his *princes* concerning *Jeremiah* the prophet, *Behold he is in your hand; for the king is not he that can do any thing against you*, Jer. xxxviii. 5.

C. This was *un-kinging* himself, it was downright *abdication*; for he who no longer commands, is no longer a king.

## The REHEARSAL. 7

*king.* But what was the reason of this malice of the *princes* against *Jeremiah*?

3. *R.* He was sent from *God* to tell them the only way to save themselves and their country, in a *war* they were then engaged in against the *Chaldeans*; but it was a way not so agreeable to *flesh* and *blood*, to *pride* and *ambition* and *self-seeking*, therefore they would have none of it, and would rather put all to the hazard, than submit to the *commands* of *God*. But *Zedekiah* the *king* was convinced, and willing to do what *God* commanded, though to the lessening of himself, and putting on a piece of *self-denial*, no less than from a *king* to become a *tributary* and a *subject*, as he was before; for he had rebelled against the *king* of *Babylon*, to whom he had sworn, which was the cause of the war; and *God* would have had him humble himself, and return under the subjection of the *king* of *Babylon*, which, if he would do, then *God* promised him *safety* and to his country; but if they would not, but persist in that unlawful war, contrary to their *oaths*, then *God* threatened *destruction* to them both, as it came to pass. For this cause these *lords* and *princes* sought the life of *Jeremiah*, saying, he *weakened the hands of the people*; and the *king* had rendered himself so little as not to be able to protect him; he feared his *lords* more than *God*!

4. *C.* And so came of it—for both he and they were destroyed by that *king* whose *oath* they had broken. As *God* said of this same *Zedekiah*, *Ezek. xvii. 18, 19.* *Seeing he despised the oath by breaking the covenant, when so, he had given his hand, and hath done all these things, he shall not escape. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, as I live, surely mine oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it, will I recompence upon his own head.*

*R.* Here it is called the *oath* of *God*, and the *oath* of the *king* of *Babylon*; it was made to the *king* of *Babylon*, so was his *oath*; but every *oath* is made to *God*, being made in his name, and he invoked as the *witness*, and as the *revenger* of the *breach* of it, and so it is the *oath* of *God*.

B 4

C. But

C. But suppose the *oath* that I take be an *unlawful oath*?

5. R. An *unlawful oath* obligeth to nothing but *repentance*; no man can oblige himself to *sin*; therefore if I have taken an *oath* which is contrary to my *duty*, in any thing wherein I am obliged by the law of *God*, I ought to *repent* of my having taken such an *oath*, but by no means to keep it. It is said that *Herod* beheaded *John the Baptist*, for his *oath's* sake. Here was a tender *conscience* indeed! he added *murder* to a rash and wicked *oath*. If our *oaths* could *dispense* with the *laws* of *God*, and free us from the *obligation* of them, we might soon get rid of them all! and how *absurd* and *blasphemous* is it, to appeal to *God* and call him to *witness* to our *breach* of his *laws*! to pray to him to *bless* us, and to give us *success* in our *transgressing* his *commandments*!

C. And it is the heaviest *curse* where *God* does so *bless* us, that is, to give us *success* in our *wickedness*, that we *sin* still on, and more *presumptuously*, thinking *God* is on our side. It is his saying, *Let him that is filthy, be filthy still*, till we fill up our *measure*, and *judgment* overtake us.

6. But, *master*, in the same *Review* you are upon, that of the 16th instant, after his *tyranny* of *Reboboam* (of which you have spoke already) he brings in another, which he makes parallel to it, that of king *James* the second, for he has always a *fetch* in the *instances* and *examples* he brings; and as the objection against *Reboboam* was upon his *accession* to the *crown*, so he lays his objection against the late king *James* in the same manner, and says, in his history of *tyranny*, "At last king *James* came to the *crown*, and blind enough you may be sure we were, to let him mount the *throne*, which, by our constitution, he, as a *papist*, ought not to have possessed, all his claim of blood to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding."

R. This was spoke to the *mob* (if he was not so ignorant himself) to think there was any *law*, when king *James* came to the *crown*, to hinder a *papist* to succeed; if he is of that opinion, let him produce the *law* that said so; if he cannot, let him own his *mistake*, if not his *malice*.  
But

But here he flies in the face of our *parliaments*, and of the whole *nation*; and, which is more than all, of his own beloved *whigs* and *dissenters*; for did they not all *address* and *congratulate* king *James* upon his *accession*, and promise eternal *loyalty*? And did not our *parliament* recognize his right in the fullest manner?

7. But I will give him another *authority*, which is greater with him than all our *parliaments*, that is, the *Confession of Faith*, which the *kirk* still stands by, and enjoins, as well as our *presbyterians* in *England*; there *chap. iii.* he will find it declared, that no difference in *religion*, or even *infidelity*, does take away the right of the *king*. So that the *presbyterians* must mend their own *Confession of Faith*, as well as all our *laws* and *acts of parliament* (before the late king *James*) or else pronounce their *advocate-general*, Mr. *De Foe*, to be either very *ignorant*, or, which is worse, a *wilful prevaricator*.

C. But have they not mended their *Confession of Faith* since the *revolution*?

R. No, *countryman*, it is an odd thing to mend *confessions of faith*! Will the *Review* give us a *revolution-faith*, as well as a *revolution-church*, and *revolution-principles*!

C. But then their *Confession of Faith* stands in direct opposition to the late *acts of parliament* which exclude *papists* from the *crown*.

R. Let them look to that—And how they can reconcile their taking this *Confession of Faith*, and at the same time owning these *acts of parliament*!

8. C. Are not these rank *Jacobites*, whose *faith* is against the *revolution-settlement*? The *Review* writes like a *Jacobite* in *masquerade*; he makes *objections* against the late king *James*, which he knows are no *objections* at all. Is not this to betray the *cause*? if his *cause* be the *revolution*, he well deserves *payment* for his *pains*!

---

Wednesday, March 31. 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 310.

---

1. Some sport at parting with Mr. Review.
2. His pleasant excuse for not defending his *experiment*.
3. His second excuse yet *pleasanter*.
4. The fault in the party more than in him.
5. Curs'd cows short horns, the Review's one answer to every thing.

Com. **L**ET us have a little diversion, *master*, that we may part in good humour, and be apter to listen to *serious* things afterwards.

1. R. I know not how to entertain you better than with the same *gentleman* (should I say?) who has made us so much sport of late. He is the only one of all the *scandalous club* that now sticks by me. The other papers are dropt, or have given me over, and their *cause* to boot, as no longer *defensible*. Every body but he is ashamed of it, though none has more reason; but he is resolved to *blunder* it still on, to make it more *ridiculous*!

I have not yet told you his last defence of himself and his *experiment* against the *answer* that is come out to it. This you will find in his *Review* of the 4th instant, where he says of me,

"In the particular cases which he treats with me of, he forms imaginary victories for himself, and boasts of his conquests, and of being unanswerable; particularly in the case of *Abraham Gill*, he says, I answer a book without seeing it, in which he forgets himself, I do not pretend to answer or meddle with their book, I think it not to be the case at all."

C. What is the case then? Your objection was, that his book called the *Experiment*, ushered into the world with so great *pomp*, dedicated to the *queen*, and calling  
God

God to witness for the truth of it, and putting the whole cause of the dissenters upon it, that this book was answered, and proved to be a bundle of lies from top to bottom, with the forgery of holy orders, of affidavits, and the grossest conspiracy against the church that this or any age can produce. This was the charge against Mr. De Foe. And was there any other way to clear himself from it, than by replying to the said answer, and justifying the truth of his Experiment? But he says, *I think not this to be the case at all.* Pray then, what does he make the case?

2. R. He says, "I cleared up the case in two heads, 1. As to my concern in it, where I think I gave a particular of the concern I had in it, and referred him to one of the gentlemen concerned.

C. As to his concern in it — What does he mean by his concern? Did not he write the Experiment? And was it none of his concern whether he wrote truth or not? He only tells how he was drawn into it, and employ'd by the dissenters to do it — much to their reputation! — He says he had the free leave of five or six of them to tell their names, if he was questioned about it. But he will tell none of their names. He says, he referred you to one of the gentlemen concerned. But he denied any concern in it, and refused to tell any of the others names. This is the first head of his clearing. If you please let us have the second.

3. R. Secondly, says he, "I stated the question so as he (*meaning me*) will not meddle with it, according to his custom, not to speak when he is run aground; and as this is the state of the case, I think, till it is replied to, there is no need to answer, or read his book."

C. He is perfectly bamboozl'd — You never put any other state of the question than whether his Experiment was truth or not? And that he should reply to the answer to it, and justify his Experiment if he could. And I see no other state of the case that he himself puts.

R. O, yes! he puts it thus.

1. "That let *Abraham Gill* be what they please, whether or no they had any right to press him for a soldier? That the question is, not whether *Gill* was a whore-master or no; but whether he ought to be pressed for a soldier? 2. That all the villany they charge upon *Gill* did not move them to press him till he reformed, and became a *dissenter*, and that then they press'd him, not as a man of crime, but as a *dissenter*, and as an *experiment* upon the party. Now Mr. *Rehearsal* is so violent with his book, and for an answer to it, if he will answer these previous questions, I'll read and reply to the rest; otherwise I see no need of it."

C. I can shew Mr. *Review* a need of it—For how does he know but these very questions are answered in that book, which he will not read till they are answered?

4. R. And I can tell him they are answered in that same book. And would he have me repeat the book here to him, because he will not read it?

But now I must tell him more. That none of these things is the question: It is not the question, whether *Abraham Gill* was a whore-master? or whether he might be pressed for a soldier? But whether what is told in the *Experiment* upon that occasion be truth or not? Of making this a party-cause, and laying load so terribly upon the church for it? In short, whether the *Experiment* be not the most abominable and lying book extant! and wrote with all the malice, as well as falsehood, that hell can suggest? And it is not so much Mr. *De Foe's* part in it that we are concerned for, but of the party that employed him, and still continue to employ him, who buoy up his credit, and encourage his papers with the utmost spite against the church and the monarchy! These, these are the men who are to be animadverted upon, whom we ought to watch, and guard against their pernicious designs! who are ashamed of no lies, nor scruple to make use of the basest of instruments!

5. C. 'Tis well that curs'd cows have short horns. Here is an advocate of theirs, who shames the shameless cause he would defend. Is your *Experiment* truth? Say you;

you ; *That is not the question*, cries he. Will you *reply* to the answer ? *I'll tell you how I came engaged* ; and yet I will not tell you. Have you not produced *forg'd orders* and *forged affidavits* ? *I tell you how I was engaged* — Have not your *lies* been *detected* ? *I tell you how I was engaged* — Will you *justify* what you have said, or will you *confess* and *retract* ? *I tell you how I was engaged* — This is all you get from him. And bray him in a mortar, you will get no more out of him !

---

Saturday, April 3, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 311.

---

1. The great question, *who shall be judge ?*
2. Exemplify'd in trials at law.
3. A short method of coming at the point.
4. The church the best interpreter of scripture.
5. Who is judge whether there is a God or not ?
6. The author and abettors of the book of the Rights proved to be atheists.
7. A judgment of discretion, and of authority.
8. The church of Rome claiming a judgment of authority in matters of faith, is blasphemy. Who shall be judge ? is only to be asked in small matters.

1. C. WELL, master, it is almost time to have done with the *presbyterians* ; let us now proceed to the *papists*. For, to tell you the truth, I am very much stumbled, and put to a loss by what I have heard lately from some of their *priests*. And if you do not help me out, I know not what will become of me. The matter is this : when I talk with them out of the *scriptures* or from my own reason, they still come over me with this question, *who shall be judge ?* And can I say, that I am a better judge than the church ? Will I be more wise than all the learned men, and holy Fathers ever since Christ ? And must I not be concluded by what the councils in all ages have determined ? and what can I say to this ? I under-

understand not the *fathers* and *councils*, that belongs to *learned* men. What then have I to say? I am put to a full *stop* upon every point with this, *who shall be judge?* And if I cannot find an answer to this, we, poor *countrymen*, must shut up our mouths, and let these *priests* carry us whither they will.

2. And they enforce this upon us, by shewing us the like in other cases which we plainly understand, and which we cannot deny; for example, if there is a dispute betwixt me and my neighbour about a *house*, a *horse*, or an *estate*, it is not what he thinks, or I think, must determine it; but there must be a *judge* that has *authority* to determine it, and what he *adjudges* upon *trial*, that must stand. Now how much more, say they, must there be a *judge* in matters of *faith*, upon which our *souls* depend? Or else the world is left at an utter *uncertainty*, and every man must *believe* as he pleases. And considering the greatest number of mankind to be *ignorant* and *unlearned*, what a condition would this bring the world to, if God had not left some *judge* upon earth to ascertain the *faith*, and to determine *controversies*? And who should this *judge* be but the *church*, which is called the *pillar* and *ground* of the *truth*?

3. Now, *master*, you have sometimes a short way to determine a point, and give one a clear thought of a thing, such as may fit common capacities like mine, and make it easy to us, without sending us to *learned* books, and things we do not understand. I wish you may be so happy in this, and not to carry me out of my depth for an answer; for that will but perplex the cause the more, and naturally lead me back to the question, *Who shall be judge?*

4. R. You have put the *objection* as strong as it will bear. And if I were discoursing with a *popish priest*, I would tell him, that we allow the *church* to be the best *interpreter* of the *holy scriptures*; that is, the *church* from the beginning. That what has been held by all *Christian churches*, and at all *times*, we will certainly receive.

Then

Then I would shew him the great fallacy of applying to the church of Rome whatever is said of the church in general, either in the scriptures, or in the primitive fathers. And, in short, we are willing to put the issue with them upon the current sense of the church in all ages. We stand by this, and appeal to it in all our disputes with them.

But I give not this answer to you! for, as you say, it would carry you out of your depth, and you are not capable of examining this matter, which requires skill and knowledge in the fathers, councils, &c. And you would naturally say, *who shall be judge of these things?*

Therefore to come short to you, I ask you, Who is judge whether there is a God or not?

5. C. Bless me! master, you fright me! what sort of a question is this? Can any body be a judge over God? Can any body be such a judge, that if he should say there was no God, therefore there was none?

R. You have answered right, countryman. You shall see the meaning of my question presently. But are not you judge whether you will believe a God or not?

C. That is, I may chuse whether I will believe it or not, at least, whether I will own it, as Joshua said, Chap. xxiv. 15. Choose you this day whom ye will serve, whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the Flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: But as for me, and my house, we will serve the Lord. And as Elijah said, 1 Kings xviii. 21. How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him. But all this is only as to our own opinion, whether we will believe or follow God, or not? Not that the being of God does depend upon our judgment; that would be most hideous blasphemy!

6. R. But not more blasphemous than the book of the Rights, which makes the authority of God to depend upon the choice of the people, and to be derived from it. For the being and the authority of God are inseparable, and equally indelivative from any other. And who deny  
his

his *authority*, deny his *being*; therefore the *author* of that *book* of the *Rights*, and all its *abettors*, if they speak their minds, are not only *practical* but *speculative* and *literal* *atheists*.

7. But to return to our subject: The *opinion* of a man is called a *judgment* of *discretion*, and this is *unlimited*, and in all things, even whether there be a *God* or not.

But a *judgment* of *authority* does determine the *right* of the thing *judged*, as when a *judge* determines a dispute in *law* about a *house* or an *estate*. And his *authority* is *superior* to the thing that he *judges*; else he could not be *judge* of it. Thus if any were *judge*, in this sense, that is, of *authority*, whether there were a *God* or not? It would follow, that he was *superior* to *God*, and that the *being* of *God* did depend upon his *judgment*, and all the *blasphemy* you have mentioned.

C. I apprehend all this very well; but now, pray, tell me to what purpose you have brought this in?

8. R. Because the *judgment* which the *church* of *Rome* claims in matters of *faith*, is a *judgment* of *authority*, that you must *believe* such things to be of *faith*, because she delivers them to you as such; which, by what I have said, is no less than *blasphemy*. And if it will not hold in the first *article* of the *creed*, the belief of a *God*, neither will it in the rest, as whether there is a *Christ* or not? Whether he *died*, *rose* again, &c. Whether there will be a *resurrection* of the *dead*, and a future *judgment*? These *articles* of *faith* are of too *high* a nature to be subjected to any human *authority*. And it is only of smaller matters, and of less consequence, wherein the question can be asked, *who shall be judge*? It is only of matters to which human *authority* is *superior*, and that are *determinable* by it. What then is the ground of our *believing* the *articles* of *faith*; how far the *church* is herein concerned, and what her proper *authority* is, shall be told you in my next.

Wednesday, April 7, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup>. 312.

1. Why we believe a *God*.
2. We receive the knowledge of *Christ* from the *church*; but not from her *authority*.
3. We receive it from her *evidence*.
4. This evidence is *infallible*, not from the *authority* of the *relators*, but from the *nature* of the *evidence*.
5. How the *church* is the *pillar and ground of the truth*.
6. Wherein her *authority* does properly consist.
7. No *salvation* in the *ordinary* way out of the *church*.
8. The *dispensations* of *God* are by the hands of *men*.

1. Coun. **N**OW, *master*, you are to tell me how it is I believe a *God*, since I am not to take it from the *authority* of the *church*.

R. The works of *creation* demonstrate a *God*. For nothing can make itself, and it is purely from your own reason that you believe a *God*.

C. But how do I believe a *Christ*? Is it not the *church* has taught me that?

2. R. Yes, the *church* has taught it you; but not by way of *authority*, as if you were to believe it, because you are to believe the *church*; for you could not believe a *Christian church*, without first believing a *Christ*; and the *church* pretends to no other *authority* than what she has received from *Christ*. Therefore you must first believe a *Christ*, before you can know what *authority* he has given to his *church*. The *church* likewise teaches you to believe in *God*: It is the first *article* in the *creed* of the *church*. But as we discoursed last time, it would be the highest *blasphemy*, as well as *nonsense*, to say, We believe a *God* from the *authority* of the *church*. The same it is to say, We believe a *Christ* upon her *authority*.

3. C. Upon

3. C. Upon what *authority* then do we believe a *Christ*?

R. Upon no *authority*; because no *authority* upon earth is so great as his, and we cannot believe a greater *authority* for a lesser; we believe it upon *evidence*.

C. But then that *evidence* must be *infallible*; for our belief of any thing cannot be *surer* than the *evidence* that we have for it.

4. R. The *evidence* is *infallible*; as is demonstrated in the *Short method with the deists*, (to which I referred you before) not from the *infallibility* of any or all of the *relators*, but from the *nature* of the *evidence*, which is such, as that it is *impossible* we should be imposed upon. And the same *evidence* is for the truth of the holy *scriptures*, as is there likewise fully shewed. Such plain *evidence* as we have for there being such a town as *Rome* or *Constantinople*, or that there was such a man as king *Charles I.* or *Henry VIII.* And even greater than all this, by the *prophecies* that went before, from the beginning of the world, of the things there related; which it was impossible to be concerted or counterfeited, these *prophecies* being known and publick in the world long before what they foretold came to pass.

5. C. How then is the church called the *pillar* and *ground* of the truth, if we receive not the belief of a *God*, or of *Christ*, or of the holy *scriptures*, upon her *authority*?

R. We receive it upon her *evidence*, though not her *authority*. The *sacred oracles* of the *scriptures* were deposited with her to be kept, to be preached and propagated. This makes her the *pillar*, and only *pillar* upon earth of this grand *depositum*. Not that she has *dominion* over our faith, as the *apostle* speaks, but is a *helper* of our joy. For by faith we stand, 2 Cor. i. 24. That is, by faith in *Christ*, not in the church. The church is not the object of our faith; it is *blasphemy* to say it. Nor does even the church of *Rome* pretend to it.

C. Has the church then no *authority* at all, but to be considered only as an *evidence* to the truth?

6. R. The

6. R. The church has very great authority, though not over God or Christ, or the holy scriptures. But her authority is over her flock, who are commanded by Christ to be subject to her. She has authority to preach the word to them, to sign and seal the covenant of God with them in the holy sacraments, and in the remitting or retaining of their sins. (See the first volume of the censures of the church.) She has the keys of the kingdom of heaven committed to her, to open or to shut, to bless and to curse in the name of the Lord, who has promised to ratify in heaven her sentence, when justly passed upon earth; and who despises her, despises Christ, and will be judged as such. All this is comprehended under the name of discipline, and the power of the keys, and is left wholly in her hands, as she will be answerable for the faithful discharge of it to Christ the chief Shepherd; but accountable to no other power upon earth. And in this sense too she may be called the pillar of the truth, not only as the keeper of this sacred depositum, but the administrator and dispenser of it: To offer up the incense of the prayers of the saints, and to bless them in the name of the Lord. Thus standing in the midst betwixt God and the people in the person of their great Mediator; whose sacrifices her priests offer up continually for the people, in representation and in conjunction with what Christ in person offers to his Father in heaven.

C. This power and authority of the church is indeed very great; and reaches even to heaven, and has its effect to all eternity.

7. R. The church is the spouse of Christ to bring forth children unto God. It is said, Acts ii. 47. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved. God our Father receives his children out of the arms of the church our mother; so he has decreed, and there is no other ordinary means of salvation. Therefore who are justly thrown out of her communion, or unjustly separate themselves, are cut off from the communion of God, and have forfeited their right to all the promises in the gospel, which are every one made to the church, and to none

none other. How *God* will deal with such, or what allowances he will make for *ignorance*, the prejudices of *education*, or other *unmalicious* causes of their *separation*, in his *extraordinary* and *uncovenanted* mercies, we must not determine: But this we are sure of, that they are out of the *covenant*, and cannot *plead* it. They may say, *God* is *merciful*, but they cannot say, *he* is *faithful* and *just* to *forgive* their *sins*; for that can be said only on account of the *covenant*: which being made only with his *church*, consequently they who are out of the *church*, are out of the *covenant*.

8. C. How much more harden'd are we than the *Jews*? They were convinced by a *miracle*, that the *Son* of *man* had power on *earth* to *forgive* *sins*. And they marvelled and glorified *God*, who had given such power unto men, Matth. ix. 6, 7, 8. It is not to one man, but to men. And *Christ* gave the same power in express words to other men, *whosoever* *sins* ye remit, &c. And *whatsoever* ye shall bind on *earth*, &c. And *Christ* sent these, as his *Father* had sent him; that is, with this same power; and promised to be with them, in the execution of it, to the end of the world; which shews it was to continue, and to be delegated to others after the death of the *apostles*. Thus you have instructed me, *master*; and particularly in this too, that *God* dispenses every thing to us by the hands of *men*, whom he has appointed. That this has been his method from the beginning of the world, and will be the same to the end. Therefore that *God* judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the *Son*, because he is the *Son* of *man*.

---

Saturday, April 10, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 313.

---

1. The *church of Rome*, by the *authority* she pretends, may give us a new *gospel*.
2. She would be more *infallible* than the *apostles*, or *angels of heaven*.
3. And by this plainly *undermines* the *faith*.
4. Unless I am *infallible* my self, I can never be sure of the *infallibility* of the *church of Rome*.
5. The *logomachy* of the words *judge* and *judgment*.
6. The *judgment of discretion* does not *determine* the thing, but the *judgment of authority* does.

1. Coun. **I**T seems plain to me, *master*, that what the *church of Rome* pretends to, to make the truth of the *scriptures*, and our *faith*, depend upon the *authority* of their *church*, proves too much for them, for it proves more than they are willing to own, that is, that if the *church* gave us new *scriptures*, and a new *faith*, we are obliged to receive them, because they would then, stand upon the same *authority* as the old ones, that is, the *authority* of the *church*.

R. 2. I am glad to see you take the *argument* so right, *countryman*; and now to try you further, I will give you the *answer* the *church of Rome* makes to this, and see how you can defend what you have said. They say then, that it is *impossible* the *church* should give us new *scriptures*, or a new *faith*, because she cannot *err*, and therefore that such a *supposition* is *absurd*, and they will not give you leave to make it.

C. Is it more *absurd* than what the *apostles* said of themselves? *Gal. i. 8, 9. Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. May we not then say the same of any church upon earth? But if the church*

church of Rome say not as the *apostles* did, it will follow they preach not the same *doctrine*, or the same ground of *faith* as the *apostles* did. And it is plain in this, that the *apostles* set up only as *witnesses* to the truth of the *gospel*, of what *Christ* had done and taught. This is *evidence*, not *authority*; therefore well might they say, if we, or an angel from *heaven* should preach any other *gospel*, let him be *accursed*; for the truth of the *gospel* of *Christ* stands not on the *authority* of men or angels; it would be *blasphemy* to say it. And is it not the same *blasphemy* to say, that our *faith* stands on the *authority* of the church of Rome! Is it *absurd* then to make such a *supposition* as to the church of Rome, which the *apostles* made as to themselves, and even as to angels of *heaven*! It would be *absurd* indeed, if we go upon the argument of *authority*, and not upon *evidence*; for if our *faith* stand upon the *authority* of whatever church, then we are to receive as *faith* whatever that church should propose to us as such; and it would be *absurd* to say she could err in *faith*, when her *authority* makes it *faith*.

3. R. You have answered fully and clearly, *countryman*; and if the church of Rome would lay by her *authority* as to matters of *faith*, and be content to stand only as an *evidence* of it, as the *apostles* did, our disputes with her would sooner be at an end; and a true *evidence* would never be afraid of being examined *strictly* and very *particularly*, for the truth would still appear the more. But when, instead of an *evidence*, the church of Rome will needs be a *judge* in matters of *faith*, and interpose her *authority*, and will not suffer it to be disputed, she truly undermines the *faith*, and renders it all *precarious*, as well as exposes her own *guilt*, in thus endeavouring to stop the examination of what she has delivered as of *faith*, and answers every enquiry with, *Who shall be judge?*

4. C. And who shall be *judge* of that *judge*? for if I believe any one to be *judge*, I must believe it upon some *reason* or other, and if that *reason* be not good, I am *deceived*: so that if I be not *infallible* my self, I can never be *sure* that I *judge* right in the choice of a *judge*, and my  
belief

*belief* of the *infallibility* of any other cannot rise *higher* than the *reason* of my *belief*. So that upon the whole, I am left still to *judge* for my self, as you said at the beginning, even as to the *belief* of a *God*. And if in that, then surely as to what *religion* or *church* I should be of; for I would ask, *who is judge* among *Christians*, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, and *Heathens*, which of all these sorts is in the right? It would be ridiculous for any of them to say to the others, my *church* is *judge*, for the rest think their *churches* as good as his, and better. And indeed in all matters of *opinion* or *belief* it is a perfect *contradiction* to ask, *who shall be judge*? You may as well say, who is *judge* what I shall *think*? They say, *thoughts are free*, and it is impossible for a man to be of any other *opinion* than his own, unless he is convinced by *reason*, and then he can as little help the changing his *opinion*, it is his own *opinion* still; a man cannot do otherwise than *think* as he is *persuaded*, though for many *reasons* he may *dissemble* it. When a man offers me *reasons* why the *church* of *Rome*, or any other, is an *infallible judge*, does he not make me *judge* of those *reasons*? why else does he offer them to me? so that the whole results to my own *reason* still; and this grand question, *who shall be judge*? has just left me where it found me.

5. R. As I told you before, when we were upon the controversy with the *presbyterians*, that the whole of their dispute did turn upon the *jingle* of the two words *episcopacy* and *presbytery*, both of which might be taken in the *same* and *different* senses: so in this dispute with the *church* of *Rome*, of *Who shall be judge*? the whole turns upon as poor a *logomachy* or strife of words, that is, of the word *judge* or *judgment*; for, as I told you before, there is a *judgment* of *discretion* or *opinion*, and a *judgment* of *authority*, which *determines* the *cause* before it. And these two sorts of *judgment* are *toto cælo* different, as distant as the *east* is from the *west*, though the words *judge* or *judgment* are the same, which may deceive some unwary people. But I hope I have made it evident, that as the *belief* of a *God*, and of all the other *articles* in the *Creed*,  
must

must be received by the *judgment of discretion*, of which God alone is *judge*: so that to submit our *faith* to any *judgment of authority* in any man or men, is to submit *divine* things, and God himself to *human judgment*, which is highly *blasphemous*.

6. C. But do you not *submit* these things to the *judgment of discretion*? since you say we believe these things by it.

R. No, the *judgment of discretion* is only the *means* by which we *believe*; as the *eye* is that by which I *see*. My *eye* may be faulty, and I may see wrong, but yet I can be no surer of what I *see*, than I am of the truth of my *fight*; but this is only as to my self, not as to the thing that I *see*, which remains the *same*, whether I *see* it right or not. Thus many men have false *notions of God*, but this being only an *opinion* or *judgment of discretion*, has effect only as to these men, not at all as to the *being of a God*, or the *truth of any other article of faith*. But if I have a *judgment of authority* to determine of these things, then I am *superior* to them, and they are to be *believed* upon my *authority*, which is the *blasphemy* I spoke of.

C. Now I see clearly, that as I cannot be surer of the *being of a God*, than I am of those *reasons* that persuade me to *believe* it; far less can I believe the *infallibility* of any *church*, but upon my own *reason*; and I can no more *believe* by the *judgment* of another, than I can *see* with another man's *eyes*.

Wednesday, April 14, 1708. No. 314.

1. The church a great help to the faith, though it stands not upon her authority.
2. Of the canon of the scripture. The books of *Apocrypha* relate to the *Old Testament*, and were not in the canon of the *Jews*.
3. The testimony of *St. Jerom* against the *Apocrypha*.
4. The authority of *St. Jerom* in this case, countenanc'd by the church of *Rome*, and why.
5. *Bishop Cosins* his *History of the Canon of the holy Scriptures*.
6. A proof against the *Apocrypha* from *2 Maccab. xv. 38*.
7. An argument why no lessons in the *liturgy* should be taken out of the *Apocrypha*. None are in the *Common Prayer Book* appointed for *Scotland*.
8. Of the canon of the *New Testament*, and how ascertained, by the evidence, not the authority of the church.

1. Coun. **Y**OU say, master, that I can no more believe by the judgment of another, than I can see with another man's eyes; but as a man that has better eyes than I have, may help me to see my way the better, so may not my judgment be improved by the better judgment of another? And is not the judgment of the church most to be regarded in matters of faith or of religion?

R. Yes, countryman, I told you that the church was the great evidence of the faith, and so the pillar of it; and in lesser matters her authority too may interpose.

2. C. Let me bring this to a particular instance; tho' the authority of the holy scriptures cannot depend upon the authority of the church, as you have instructed me;

VOL. V.

C

yet

yet as to the *canon* of the *scripture*, and which *books* are *canonical* or not, must we not receive that from the *authority* of the *church*? for you know there is a great dispute betwixt the *church* of *Rome* and us about this, we denying the *apocryphal* books to be *canonical*, and they affirming it.

R. If they had disputed any of the *books* of the *New Testament* with us, they might have had more to say. But all those *books* we call *Apocrypha* being *Jewish* books, and put into the *canon* of the *Old Testament* by the *church* of *Rome*, exposes her pretence very much, for does her *authority* reach backward, and extend to the *church* of the *Jews*, before *Christ* came into the world?

C. Methinks this should be decided by the *church* of the *Jews*, for the *Old Testament* was their *scripture*, and we received it from them.

R. And they never received the *apocryphal* books into the *canon* of their *scriptures*, nor do at this day; so that their evidence is against the *church* of *Rome* in this matter.

C. And what other evidence she can have of things done before her time, is hard for me to imagine. But, master, were these *apocryphal* books always received in the *church* of *Rome* as *canonical*?

3. R. No, countryman, for St. *Jerom* in his *Prologus Galeatus*, and his *prefaces* to several books of the *bible*, does expressly name all the *apocryphal* books, and exclude them from being *canonical*: he says, that though the *church* does read them, as good and holy books, and containing many excellent precepts of morality, yet that she does not receive them into the *canon* of the holy *scriptures*, or think them sufficient to have any doctrine of faith proved by them.

C. But will the *papists* abide by the testimony of St. *Jerom* in this case?

4. R. I see not how they can refuse it, for his *Prologus Galeatus* and these *prefaces* are printed at *Rome*, and every where in all the *papist* countries, and prefixed to their vulgar *Latin* bibles, which are of the highest authority with them. I never see any of them that wanted it.

C. Then

C. Then indeed I see not how they can get over it; and these *prefaces* are a flat *contradiction* to their *bible*; and yet by being thus prefixed to it, seems to have likewise their *authority*.

R. And they could not well deny letting St. *Jerom* have all this *countenance* from them, not only from the great *eminence* of that holy *father*, but because he had translated the *bible* into *Latin*, and their *vulgar Latin* is chiefly taken from this translation of St. *Jerom*. And these were the *prefaces* he had prefixt to it.

C. And can any think that so *learned* a man as St. *Jerom*, and who particularly had taken such pains in the holy *scriptures*, did not know them, and that *canon* of them which was then received in the *church*? But when was that, *maſter*?

5. R. St. *Jerom* lived in the *ſiſth century*, ſo that we may be affirmed the *apocryphal books* were not received into the *canon* at that time. But as to this whole matter, how the *apocryphal books* came at laſt to be put into the *canon* by the *church of Rome*, what *oppoſition* was made to it, and the current ſenſe of the *fathers* concerning it, I refer you to an *Engliſh book*, you will read with great pleaſure, and which has not yet been answered by any of the *church of Rome* that I know of, that is, *Biſhop Coſin's Hiſtory of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures*.

6. But now for the preſent, I will leave it to you to judge, whether the *Holy Ghoſt* could utter ſuch an excuſe as this for the *weakneſs* of his performance, which you will find 2 *Maccabees* xv. 38. And here I will make an end. And if I have done well, and as is fitting the ſtory, it is that which I deſired: But if ſlenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.

C. What! God to make an excuſe as if his doing was but ſlenderly and meanly, and to ſay it was the beſt he could attain unto! It ſeems *blaſphemous* to me to aſcribe ſuch words to the *dictate* of the *Holy Ghoſt*! Nor could the man who wrote them think himſelf *inſpired* by God.

But, *master*, why are these *apocryphal* books read in our church; since she does not receive them into the canon?

7. R. I told you from St. *Jerom*, that the church did read them for instruction, though not for proving any article of faith, and we read but some of them. None of the *Maccabees* is read in our church.

C. But why should any of them be read as lessons, and part of the divine service? In the exhortation before the beginning of morning and evening prayers, the bearing of God's holy word is mentioned as part of that worship we owe to him; and then to hear the *Apocrypha* read, which we do not own to be his word! however otherwise instructive or commendable, yet it cannot be called any part of his worship.

R. For this reason, all the lessons out of the *Apocrypha* are left out in the *Common-Prayer Book*, appointed for the church of Scotland, commonly called, *Bishop Laud's Common-Prayer Book*, because he is supposed to have had a hand in the compiling it; a sure mark that he was possibly inclined! and indeed, in many respects, it is better and more primitive than ours, which makes the dissenters more angry with it than with ours.

8. C. But now, *master*, I have a question to ask concerning the canon of the *New Testament*. I have heard that in the primitive times, there were false gospels put out by the heretics, and false epistles coined by them, as epistles of the apostles. Now suppose the true and the false to lie together upon a table and jumbled together, how should they know the true from the false? And must not the authority of the church be here appealed to?

R. No, countryman, only the evidence of the church; the churches carefully kept the gospels and epistles which were given or sent to them by the apostles, and transmitted copies of them to the other churches, by which means they were publickly and generally known, and the originals were to be recurred to upon occasion; and by this means the fathers in those times confuted the heretics, by challenging them to produce the originals of those epistles and gospels they set up, where kept, and to what

what churches they were sent. But the notion of an heap of papers upon a table is mis-stating the question, and is used by the papists to lead us to the skill and authority, instead of the evidence of the church, to adjust the canon of the scriptures.

---

Saturday, April 17, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 315.

---

1. The church of Rome pretends to an absolute authority in matters of faith, shewed from Bellarmin.
2. Some deny the authority of Bellarmin.
3. If Bellarmin did not know the faith, how should the common people know it, who learn it from their parish priests?
4. That Bellarmin did write the faith of the church of Rome at that time.
5. That their faith is changed since, and their rule of faith utterly uncertain.
6. Which is consequential to their foundation principle.
7. Therefore I began with it, and have reduced the controversy to one point.

1. Coun. **I** Have been told, master, by some papists, that you have done wrong to the church of Rome, for that she pretends to no such absolute judgment of authority in matters of faith as you have said.

R. I wish with all my heart I were in the wrong to her in this, that I might do her justice in freely confessing it. I will not trouble you with quotations out of her best authors, and what her councils have said upon the point; I could shew you what the great Bellarmin has said (*de Rom. Pont. of the Bishop of Rome, chapters IV. V.*) That if he should command the practice of vice, and forbid virtue, the church was bound to believe virtue to be vice, and vice to be virtue. And in his preface he calls this plenitude of power in the bishop of Rome, *Summa rei Christianæ*, the very foundation of the Christian religion.

*religion*; and that the denying it is not only a simple error, but a damnable *heresy*. But I will not insist upon this, and much more I could say to make all this very plain to you, that thus it is taught in the church of Rome; for my method with you, *countryman*, is to keep within the compass of your understanding, and your knowledge of books and learning; and therefore to avoid many quotations, but to resolve the dispute into some one point, on which the whole cause depends, and make it so easy to you, that you may apprehend it without much trouble.

2. C. Before you come to that point, *master*, I would desire one word here by the by. Suppose the *papists* say, they will not stand by *Bellarmin* in this? that he is but one *doctor*, and they are not to be concluded by him, or any other, but only by what they call a *general council*? for I have heard them say as much of others of their own writers when quoted against them. To what purpose then have you quoted *Bellarmin*?

3. R. Is it not reasonable to suppose, that so great and celebrated a champion of the church of Rome, should understand her doctrine, and the faith then professed by her?

C. Else Lord have mercy upon the poor simple people! how should they understand it, if *Bellarmin* did not? they would then be at as great an uncertainty as they say we are, for want of a judge of controversies; for every one of the common people among them cannot go to fathers and councils, no more than we can; but learn the faith from their particular teachers or parish-priests, who learn it themselves (for the most part) from such great authors as *Bellarmin*, and may be not so good.

R. And what is it to them, whether the pope is infallible, or a council, or wherever they place their infallibility (which they are not agreed upon yet) if those who teach them lead them wrong, if they know not the faith?

4. C. It is impossible but *Bellarmin*, who you say was the most learned of all the Roman writers in that age, a *jesuit*, and a *cardinal*, and living at Rome, I say,

it is impossible but he must know the *faith* that was then in vogue at Rome, otherwise we may say, that no *papist* in the world did know it. And by the same rule that none knows it now.

R. And his books being printed at Rome, with the approbation of the pope, of their universities, and all their learned societies, and appealed to by them, as the most compleat and orthodox body of controversies then extant, and most celebrated by them, shews that he wrote according to their mind at that time.

C. At that time — Why, does their *faith* change? Is it not the same now it was then?

R. If Bellarmine knew it, it is changed; for what you supposed just now is very true, that the *papists* now do generally run down Bellarmine in this, and refuse to be determined by him.

C. Then the other thing that I supposed must hold, that their *faith* is not so plain and so ascertained as that every body may know it, That a wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err therein. Which ~~was~~ they often apply to this purpose, to shew the plainness and certainty of their *faith*, and the uncertainty and disputes about ours; for here Bellarmine asserts that infallibility of the pope, which every *papist* now denies, to be of *faith*, and the very foundation of the *faith*, and the denying of it to be *heresy*. So that either he was an *heretic* (and why then has he not been *condemned*?) Why is he still in such high esteem and reputation at Rome, and in all the *papist* countries?) Or otherwise the generality of *papists* now, particularly here in England, are all *heretics*, by the sentence of Bellarmine; and that sentence not yet repealed at Rome.

C. R. They will not repeal it, however they may dodge and shift with it upon occasion; for it is the natural consequence of their foundation *tenet*, with which I began, and with which they begin and end all their disputes; that is, *Who shall be judge!* for if the *faith* stands upon the authority of the church, and if the church of Rome be that church, (that is indeed if Rome be all the world) and if the pope is head of that church; then the authority, and

consequently the *infallibility* of the church must centre in the pope, as *Bellarmin* rightly argued from these principles; and whatever he proposes to the church as of *faith*, or as to *practice*, must be received, as *Bellarmin* says.

7. Therefore I began with the *foundation point* to make the work short; and I hope I have plainly detected the fallacy of that captious question, *Who shall be judge?* and have shewed that the *faith* does not stand upon the authority of the church, but only is *evidenc'd* to us by her witness and attestation. And this is the point to which I would bring the matter now; therefore laying aside all we have said about *Bellarmin*, &c. I give the *papists* their choice still, whether they will say, that the *faith* stands upon the authority of the church? and that the stress of the argument may be comprised in one word, and you may have a full view of it, ask them, *Who shall be judge of the articles of the Creed*, as whether there is a God or not? Whether there is a *Christ*? Whether he died and rose again? Or whether we shall die and rise again? This will bring into your mind all I have said upon this point from the beginning, for all naturally follow from it; and I have done it by way of *reckoning*; I began with the first article of the Creed, *I believe in God*. Is the church judge here? Then as to *Christ*, &c. And you will find, that in no one article of the Creed, the church of Rome dare say she is judge of that point, though she pretends that we receive the Creed upon her authority.

C. Then I will keep them to this point, and go with them to the particular articles of the Creed, beginning with the first, *I believe in God*, and ask, *Who is judge of this?* and so on; and then we shall soon see upon what foundation our *faith* stands, and that it is too great to be uilt up on any human authority.

Wednesday, April 21, 1708.

No. 316.

1. The *papist* dispute shortened.
2. Their distinction of explaining, but not making articles of faith, detected in transubstantiation, &c.
3. The sacraments are seals of the faith.
4. Of the twelve new articles of Trent.
5. Rome not the universal church. How very few own her supremacy.
6. She is neither the mother church, nor first sister church.
7. No promise to Rome, or any particular church.

1. Coun. **I** Am pretty well at rest now, *master*, from the attempts of the *papists*. For since you have taught me how to get over their master question, *Who shall be judge?* and to return it upon them, by asking, who is judge whether there is God, or a Christ? they are gruelled, and care not to carry on a dispute with me, when they have no longer the authority of their church to help them out at every turn.

2. But I must tell you an answer they give me. They say, the church of Rome does not pretend to a power to make any new articles of faith, but only to explain them against new heresies that arise.

R. For example: The great point in controversy betwixt us about transubstantiation, is only concerning the manner of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament, of which there is not a word revealed in the holy scriptures. It is only said, *This is my body*; but in what manner, whether by trans, con, or sub; that is, whether substantially, transubstantially, or consubstantially, there is not the least hint. All that is our own invention, and poor philosophy.

But pray, *countryman*, ask them which of the *articles of the creed* this *explains*? For there is not one word of this *sacrament* in any of the *three creeds*, the *Apostolical*, the *Nicene*, or *Athanasian*. How then can *transubstantiation* be an *explication* of any *article* of the *creed*?

3. C. But are not the *sacraments* part of the *covenant of grace*, and consequently of *faith*?

R. No, *countryman*, they are no part of the *covenant*. They are the *seals* of the *covenant*; and a *seal* is no part of the *covenant*, though it be added for *confirmation* of it. And the *creed* contains only the *articles* of the *covenant*, that is, the *articles of faith*.

4. C. And if there be nothing in the *creed* of the *sacraments* of the *Lord's supper*, how are the other five *sacraments* which the *church of Rome* has added, of *confirmation*, *matrimony*, *penance*, &c. how are these *explanations* of any *article* in the *creed*, when there is not a word of them in the *creed*?

R. As vain is it to pretend, that any of the *twelve new articles* of *Trent*, as of *purgatory*, *invocation of saints*, *half-communion*, &c. which are made of *faith* in the *church of Rome*, are any *explanations* of the *creed*, which says nothing at all of any of them; nor are they to be found in any *creed*, except that of *pope Pius IV.* made pursuant to the determination of the *council of Trent*, and adds *twelve new articles of faith* to those *twelve* delivered in the *Apostolical* and *Nicene creed*.

C. If they can declare *articles of faith* at this rate, they may declare a *thousand things* more to be *articles of faith*, and may with as much reason call them all *explanations* of the *creed*.

5. But, *master*, what shall I say to this, that *Rome* is the *universal church*, and the *mother church*, whence all other *Christian churches* have come; and therefore ought all to be under her *direction* and *authority*? For you know *parents* have *authority*; and *children* ought not to *rebel* against their *parents*, at least without a *valuable consideration*.

R. As

R. As to her *universality*, she can claim it only *de jure*, as being the *mother church*; for *de facto* she never was *universal*, nor *half universal*. Not one in ten of the *Christian churches* ever owned her *supremacy*, nor do at this day. She has all the *Christian churches* in *Asia* and *Africa* against her; and these are much more *memorable* than she is, or ever was. And she has not near one half of *Europe*. The great empire of *Russia* never owned her *supremacy*, and that is in extent near half of *Europe*, and near half of the other half have fallen off from her. She has now but *Italy* and *Spain* entire for her. *Germany* and *Poland* are much divided; so is *France* too, though the *protestants* there are now kept under. But I may say, that all *France* is against her *supremacy*, which the whole *assembly* of the *Gallitan church* has limited, by their memorable *decrees* in the year 1682, as well as before, not to extend to the infringement of the *customs* and *constitutions* of any *national church*. And this is indeed to take away her *supremacy* wholly; for a *limited supremacy* is like a *broken glass*, good for nothing. It is a *contradiction*; for nothing can be *limited* but by a *superior power*. Therefore a *supreme* that can be *limited* by another, is *subject* to that other, and so cannot be *supreme* in respect of that other. And this is so understood at *Rome*, the *pope* making all the opposition possible to these *decrees*; and a *French papist* would be burnt at *Rome* for an *heretick*, if they durst. Nor has *Spain* been without their *contests* with the *pope* about his *supremacy*, and even the duke of *Savoy*, and some *Italian* princes too, besides the *emperor* frequently, and others of the *papist* *German* princes. So that upon the whole, we shall find very few left who submit to the *papal supremacy*, except some *doctors* at *Rome*, who write at the *pope's* feet.

C. It is plain then that the church of *Rome* is not *universal* in fact. But what say you to her *de jure* claim, as being the *mother church*?

6. R. It is as plain that she has no claim to this; for *Jerusalem* was undoubtedly the *mother church*. There the *gospel* was first preached, and our *Saviour*

## 36 The REHEARSAL.

commanded that it should from thence be propagated through all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 47.

C. If it had been said, *beginning at Rome*, it would have been thought a full proof for her being the *mother church*. But *Jerusalem* is now in the hands of the *Turk*, may not *Rome* therefore succeed to be the *mother church*?

R. There cannot be two *mothers*; so that *Rome* can pretend to no more than to be the *eldest sister church*. Nor can she claim that neither; for *Antioch* was *Christian* before *Rome*: And the disciples were called *Christians* first in *Antioch*, Acts xi. 26.

7. But if one could be *mother* after another, then *Rome* may lose it as *Jerusalem* has done; and then where is her *perpetuity*? Which is one of the *marks* she gives for her being the *universal* or *mother church*, that the *gates of hell* shall not prevail against her, &c. Though, by the way, there is not one *promise* in all the *gospel* made to the *church* of *Rome*. But she applies to herself whatever is said of, or to the *church*, as supposing herself to be the *head* and *mother* of all *churches*; and therefore, that she shall never *fail*, but be always a *city* on a *hill*, *visible* and *conspicuous* to all the world. But the *church* of *Jerusalem* had more reason, in all respects, to apply these *promises* to herself. But indeed they were made to no *particular church*, but to the *church* in general, that *Christ* would always have a *church* somewhere in the world; though he may remove the *candlestick* of this, or that, or the other.

Saturday, April 24, 1708.

No. 317.

1. I leave the *papists* for the present. I have been wholly *serious* with them, because they are in *earnest* with religion.
2. I turn to Mr. Ben. Hoadly, who has attacked me.
3. The question *Who shall be judge?* answers him in every thing.
4. The progress of his performance upon this subject of *government*.
5. He proceeds much in the same manner as his brother *John*.
6. I love *liberty* as well as he. How he states the notion of it.
7. Which is worst, what he calls *slavery*, or *lawless confusion*?
8. No *medium* betwixt these. He includes *commonwealths*, as well as *absolute monarchies*.
9. All *governments* equally *arbitrary* in the hands of *one*, or *more*.
10. If the *people* have *power* over the *government*, it is *lawless confusion*. Mr. Hoadly is obliged to find out a *middle state*.

1. Coun. **L**EAVE off pursuing the *papists* for this time, *master*. They are now under hatches, and dare not answer for themselves; and it has not been your method to add to affliction, and fall upon the *weakest*; but rather to attack *wickedness* in *high places*, where it is *rampant* and *triumphant*, and all the world runs after it. And I have now got a *match* for you beyond *Observers* and *Reviews*, and the rest of that *scandalous club*.

R. I have thus far spoke to the *papists*, not out of *malice* or *ill-will*, but to *reclaim* them so far as in my power. For whatever others think, *countryman*, yet I am sure, that the design of these *papers* is *charity*, and to do *good* to those whom I *oppose*. And my submitting to a little *pleasantry* now and then, was to meet with those whom I could not come at otherwise, who were not pre-

prepared to attend to what was *serious*, unless it was baited with some *mirth*. And with this *guile* I have caught some of them. But this was not needful with the *papists*, who are in *earnest* with *religion*, and dare suffer for it. Therefore I have used none of this to them, but spoke wholly *serious*; and I pray *God* it may have effect. It is the substance of several conversations I have had with them, and I hope it has done them no harm; as I intend none to them by this.

But now, *countryman*, what is this new *subject* you call me upon? Who is this *match* you say you have provided for me?

2. C. It is a reverend *divine*, who has attacked you over and over again, and you have yet taken no notice of him. He names you not, nor your *papers*, he says, he scorns to read *penny papers*; but he follows you so exactly, as if he had got you by heart; and names not only your *principles*, but your very *words*, and some of them that no body else has used, that I know of, as your notion of *bastard governments*, &c. as you will find, p. 14. of his *penny-sermon* last affixed at *Harford*. And he complains of a present *writer* on this *subject*, when there is none but your self.

R. And why may not a *penny-paper* answer a *penny-sermon*? It costs the reader less *pains*, and no more *money*. But if it is below him to read this, (and yet I hold him a *penny* he does) others will read it, and that is enough for me. Come on then: *Countryman*, do you tell me what he says, and you shall be judge which of us is in the right.

C. I be judge! Master, am I a fit judge?

3. R. You can judge for yourself, *countryman*, you know what we have said upon that question, *who shall be judge*? (And though it is absurd to ask it as to *thought* or *belief*, of which *God* only can judge; yet the *law* will judge of our *actions*. And this is the point Mr. *Hoadly* has forgot in all his arguments, of which I will mind him as we go along; but I would not take the objecting part out of your hand.

4. C. He

4. C. He began this subject in a *sermon* before the Lord-mayor, &c. Sept. 29. 1705. Then he wrote a large book in defence of that *sermon*. And now lately a defence of that book by way of *preface* to it. And now last of all, he has *lick'd* over the whole in a *finishing-stroke*, and has *summ'd* it all up in this *sermon* preached at the *assizes* at Hartford the 22d of last *March*. And like his brother John Hoadly of Sarum his *assize-sermon* there last year, he has *printed* it at the request of the *grand-jury*, whose names he prefixes, full fifteen in number; as also the *high-sheriff*, and the right honourable Algernoon earl of Essex, Lord lieutenant of the county of Hartford, at all of whose request he says it was published, and to all of whom he dedicates it.

5. And to all of whom I refer what I have to say in answer to it — I have said enough to his brother's *sermon* in the foregoing volumes. I hope this has not provoked his brother Benjamin to fall upon me. I think these principles run in a blood; it is a good thing to come of an honest stock. There is something *ex traduce*, especially of the surest side, and ill company is another ill thing.

C. Well, master, but now to our business. The greatest difference betwixt you two is as to your notions of liberty. Therefore, if you please, I will begin with that.

6. R. Do, countryman; for I assure him I love liberty as well as he does, and take as little pleasure to be oppressed, harassed, and tore to pieces.

C. You will find this in p. 8. of the penny-edition. And first he tells you what liberty is not: That it is not licentiousness, or a freedom from government; for that, he says, would be anarchy and lawless confusion. But he says, It is a freedom restrained by beneficial laws, and living, and dying together with public happiness.

R. He and I do not differ yet — Go on, and tell me what he makes slavery to be, in opposition to this liberty?

7. C. He says, On the one side (of this liberty) stands slavery, which is an absolute subjection to the will of another,

*other, not bounded by any wholesome and good laws ——— On the other hand stands confusion or licentiousness, without law or government.*

R. Before we go further, I would ask him, which of these *states* is worst? Whether that *slavery*, or this *confusion*?

C. I suppose he will make no doubt of that, but will allow such a *state of lawless confusion* to be infinitely worse than the greatest *slavery* of any government.

8. R. Then the whole *cause* will lie here, whether he can find a *medium* betwixt these two *states*? In order to which I would ask again, whether by *subjection to the will of another*, he means the *will of one man*, as in *absolute monarchies*, or of a *company or society of men*, as in *commonwealths* or *democratical governments*?

C. He means *both*, or *either*; for he says, p. 8. that the *liberty or property* he pleads for, is such as cannot be *shaken by any humour or arbitrary will of one man, or society of men*.

9. R. Now I have him — For there never was any such *liberty or property* in the world, or possibly can be under any government, which may not be *shaken*, ay, and taken wholly away too by the government, whether in the hands of *one, or more*, at their *arbitrary will or humour*. What does he think of an *act of attainder*? And what does it signify, whether it be *justly* done or not? *Who shall be judge*? And to whom will you *appeal*? Must there not be a *dernier resort* in all government, from which there is no *appeal*?

10. C. But suppose he say, that the *people* in such a case may take *arms*, and overthrow such a government?

R. Then comes in that *lawless confusion*, which he thinks worse than the former *slavery*. And let him find out a *medium* betwixt these two, if he can. Or else he has given the *cause* for that very *slavery* he disputes against. For we must be subject to government either *absolutely* or *conditionally*: If *conditionally*, who is *judge of the conditions*? If *every man* is *judge*, then *every man* may take *arms*, and overturn the government when he pleases; and there is no other choice but *absolute subjection*.

Here

Here the matter *pinches*! let not Mr. Hoadly overlook it. He must find out a *middle state* betwixt what he calls *slavery* and *lawless confusion*; else all he says is but empty *declamation*?

---

Wednesday, April 28, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 318.

---

1. When Mr. Hoadly can shew the *middle state* I am his *convert*.
2. People given to *rebellion* are more governed by *imagination* than by *reason*.
3. Mr. Hoadly's remark of the *Israelites* rejecting God from being their *King*, makes directly against him.
4. He quarrels the *choice* of the *people*. They meant not to be free from *absolute monarchy*. The *monarchy* of God was *absolute*.
5. They desired only the *change* of their *King*, not of *monarchy*.
6. The *manner* of the *king* set forth by *Samuel*, was a comparison betwixt God and the *king*, not of *monarchy* and *commonwealth*; and not so terrible as Mr. Hoadly has represented it.

1. Coun. **Y**OU left M. Hoadly last time, *master*, to find out a *middle state* betwixt *absolute subjection* to government, of what sort soever it is, and that *lawless confusion* which follows the *people* taking upon them to controul the government.

R. Yes, *countryman*, this is the *issue* to which I have brought him. For to what purpose do we *doze* ourselves to think over all that we can possibly *imagine* of the *evils* that may come upon us by the *male-administration* of the government, if there be no *remedy*, or none but what is *worse* than the *disease*? This is the *point* I have always *insisted* upon, and to which I have yet received no *answer* from any that defend the cause of the *people*. I wish Mr. Hoadly may find it out for me; and if he  
shew

shew me such a *scheme of government* as that our *governors* may be *restrained* from doing us any *mischief or injustice*, and at the same time the *peace and quiet* of the people be preserved — I am his *disciple* without more ado, I shall never more open my mouth in defence of any *government*; for I am fully *convinced*, that while *government* is *administered* by the hands of *men*, there will be *miscarriages*, and *mistakes*, and *grievances* to be complained of. And this he may call *slavery*, or by what other *terrible* name he pleases; but if there be no *remedy* against this *slavery*, but by letting in that *lawless confusion* of the *resistance or rebellion* of the people, it is like throwing us into the *ocean*, to save us from a *stewer of rain*. A man may make *fine-spun orations*, and lay out his *rhetorick* to paint *slavery* in such colours as may fright the common people out of their wits, and tempt them to *arms*, and to *resist the government*. But, like the *Sicilians*, they soon find that *slavery* to be far preferable to their wretched *freedom* to *kill*, and *destroy*, and *ravage* one another. If this proceeds from the *ignorance* of the *orator*, he is *ignorant* indeed! but if from *design*, it has another name.

2. C. People are stirred up to *rebellion* by *imaginary fears*; the *fear* of such things from their *kings*, as never yet were done by any *king*. And they are *buoy'd up* with such hopes of *happiness* and *balcony days* in their *resistance*, as never was the effect of a *tumultuous revolution*!

R. The *orators of sedition* work upon the *imaginations* of men, and endeavour to cloud their *reason*. The bulk of their *barangues* against *tyranny* is, what would have been, if not prevented — And there is full loose to *imagination*, to *dreams* of *raw head and bloody bones*, and what frightens children! But if you lay before them a thousand *examples* of *nations* that are *ruined* and *undone* by *popular fury*, they pass it over *easily* with the *imagination*, that it will not be so again, though it was never otherwise in any *rebellion*, and the plain *reason* of the thing shews that it cannot be.

3. C. I

3. C. I would have your thoughts, *master*, of a remark with which Mr. Hoadly begins his *sermon*. He says, "We find the *Israelites*, after all the miracles wrought by providence in their behalf, so little sensible of the difference between *slavery* and *liberty*, as to betray the greatest uneasiness under a government in which God himself presided, and on all occasions shewed himself in a peculiar manner their King."

R. The inference I make from this, and which I wonder Mr. Hoadly should miss, is, how ill judges the people are of their own *liberty* or *slavery*. They thought it *slavery* to be under the government of God himself, and rejected him from being their King! and they took it for *liberty* to chuse a new king for themselves! Behold the *liberty* of the people! And if God cannot please them, what other king can be free from their complaints! This was an odd instance Mr. Hoadly found out, when he was arguing for the people being the best judges of their own *liberty*!

4. C. But he makes the fault and folly of the people to consist in their chusing an absolute monarchy, like all the nations round about them.

R. How! Does he find fault with the choice of the people? Are not they the best judges of their own liberties? This overthrows his whole hypothesis.

But, in the next place, what other sort of government could they have chosen? For there was then no other sort of government in any part of the world but absolute monarchy. The notion of commonwealths was not then born.

And, thirdly, while God was their King, were they not under an absolute monarchy? Was not the monarchy of God an absolute monarchy? Will Mr. Hoadly say, with the men of the Rights, that the authority of God was derived from the people, and limitable by them?

5. So that upon the whole it appears, that the change which the *Israelites* desired, was not a change of that sort or species of government under which they then were, but only a change of their king, they would have a mortal

mortal man to be their king, instead of the great God, who had chosen them to be his peculiar people out of all the nations in the earth, and therefore vouchsafed to be their king himself. He appointed their judges and their captains, and gave them orders when to fight, and how. He gave his urim and thummim to his priests, who should return the answer of God to the people, when they had occasion to consult him upon any emergency. But they grew weary of this theocracy, or government of God, and would have a visible king, whom they could see and speak with, like all the nations round about them, who should go in and out before them, and fight their battles.

6. And the folly as well as sin of this was very great. And it was upon this occasion that Samuel laid before them the manner of the king that should reign over them. Upon which Mr. Hoadly runs such divisions to paint out tyranny to the height! But the comparison that Samuel made, was only to shew the difference betwixt the manner of the government of God, and of an earthly king, to deter the people from their mad attempt. But they, after they had heard all this of the manner of the king that should reign over them, did expressly choose it, and desire it, as it is said, 1 Sam. viii. 19. Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us. So that it seems they did not think this manner of a king so terrible a thing as Mr. Hoadly would represent it; for after knowing it, and it being told them, they liked it, and chose it. And did not they know best what was for their own good? Will not Mr. Hoadly let the people have the right to judge of their own liberty and property? Samuel told them, that the king would take their sons, and appoint them for his chariots and horsemen, and make them captains over thousands, and over fifties, &c. and make their daughters his concubines, and cooks, and bakers. And they liked this very well, here were places to be had at court. And David in his lamentation over this same king said, 2 Sam. i. 24. Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul

*Saul who clothed you in scarlet, with other delights, who put on ornaments of gold upon your apparel. This was the manner of Saul. And David described his tyranny far otherwise than Mr. Hoadly has done!*

---

Saturday, May 1, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 319.

---

1. The assertors of *resistance* plead for it only in *plain* cases, and of great *consequence*.
2. All *pretences* said to be *plain*, and of the last *consequence*, which is easily believed by the *English*.
3. Nothing too hard for an *Englishman* to believe.
4. As the *Irish* massacre in England. How Mr. Hoadly may be *Magnus Apollo*.
5. The fault not in the *people* of England, but in the *principles* imbib'd, exemplified in the *pretences* of the *Israelites* against *Moses*.
6. If Mr. Hoadly cannot find out a *plainer* case, he has lost his *cause*.

1. Coun. **T**HERE is one thing, *master*, you must answer to Mr. Hoadly and his *allies*. They say, that the *people* ought not to *resist* the *government* upon any *surmizes* or *doubtful* cases of *male-administration*, but only where it is *plain* and *obvious* to every body, and cannot be *deny'd*; and where the *invasion* upon our *rights* and *liberties* is of that terrible *consequence* as threaten our *total destruction*. And there, they say, the law of *self-preservation* ought to arm every man against such a *government*.

2. R. All this shall not put me off my question, *Who shall be judge?* for we know full well, we have often seen it, that *pretences* have been set up against the *mildest* and *best* governments, and carried on with all the *assurance* and seeming *demonstration* in the world, and the *simple people* have been caught by this, to their own *destruction*, and listen to every *lye* and *story* that is told them, especially the *English*, who believe *every thing* they hear, and

and nothing that they see. They can swallow a *French league* no body ever saw, but will not believe a *Glencoe*! They were made believe that king *Char. I.* had made a league with the emperor of *Morocco*, and the *Grand Seignior* to bring over these *Mahometans* into *England* to fight against the *Hebrews* of the covenant, who had all taken *Jewish* names. And some were persuaded he had a plot, had it not been prevented (*happily* surely!) to have undermined the *Thames*, blown it up with *gunpowder*, and so to have drowned all *London*.

C. Could any body be so silly to believe such ridiculous stories?

3. R. It was nothing, countryman, when their hand was in at believing! A cardinal at *Rome* once giving instructions to missionaries they were sending to several nations, ordered those that were for *England* to begin with the point of *transubstantiation* to the people there. To which one of them objecting that this was the *hardest* point of all, and therefore thought it was better to keep that to the last, till they might be prepared for it, by receiving *easier* doctrines at first. No, no, reply'd the cardinal, you know not these men, for it is below an *Englishman* to believe anything under a contradiction!

C. I profess, master, I have observed among my neighbours in the country, not only that there is nothing too hard for them to believe against some sort of folks and causes; but that the more improbable the thing is, they are the more willing to believe it! and if it is questioned, they will affirm it with greater assurance!

4. R. Ay, and come to believe it too themselves! as they say, that a man may tell a lye so often, as to think it at last to be truth. Therefore is it not reasonable, that when stories go about in prejudice to the government (like that of the *Irish massacre* here in *England* at the beginning of the revolution) we should not be too hasty to believe it, even though many swear they saw it with their eyes? as many then said who were sent about, that they saw such towns a fire, and throats a cutting; and the fright of the people did magnify all this! nay, the impression of it

it is not over with some to this day! I have heard them say, O these bloody *Irish* and *papishes*! and who set them on! if it had not been happily prevented, what would have become of us! Thus you see how easily people are imposed upon, set but their fears a work, and it supplies all proof——they are then as sure as if they saw it with their eyes! Is it not therefore necessary in all complaints and accusations against the government, that this should be settled, *Who shall be judge?* that the matter may be examined calmly and sedately, and not left to every giddy brain to run away with it as he pleases! If the people are judges, then every man is judge; and this is that lawless confusion which Mr. Hoadly owns to be worse than any tyranny in any government. And then what medium? Who then shall be judge betwixt the government and the people? This is the point, which, if Mr. Hoadly can find out, he convinces me, and *erit mihi Magnus Apollo*! he shall be my oracle for ever after! But if he cannot do this, he must knock under, and confess that all he has said is mere jingle and delusion, and tends to overturn all government whatsoever, and make any peace or settlement impracticable to the end of the world!

S. C. You have been very hard, *master*, upon the *English* in your instances. But are there no fools in the world but we? Are not other people as apt to be imposed upon, to believe lyes, and to be as positive in them?

R. Yes, *countryman*, when they are once leavened with the false notions of liberty, and the power of the people, as *England* has been, then they are the same, for the difference is not in nations, but in principles.

I will give you an instance in our fore-fathers (for stubbornness) the *Jews*. When *Dathan* and *Abiram* had possessed the people against *Moses*, you will see the grounds of their complaint, *Num. xvi. 13, 14.* Is it a small thing (say they to *Moses*) that thou hast brought us up out of a land that floweth with milk and honey, to kill us in the wilderness, except thou make thy self altogether a prince over us? Moreover, thou hast not brought us into a land flowing with milk and honey, or given us inheritance of fields

*fields and vineyards. Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men?*

C. This was spoke with *assurance* indeed! *Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men?* Is not the case plain? Do we not see it with our eyes? Where are these *fields and vineyards*? Are we not here in a barren *wilderness*, in want of every thing? And have we not waited many years for the performance of your *promise* to us when you brought us out of *Egypt*? And have we yet seen one tittle of it, but continual *harassing and marching*, and danger of *starving* for want even of *bread and water*? And what is all this for? we now see it *plainly*; it is nothing but to *aggrandize* your self, and make your self altogether a *prince* over us, but we will bear it no longer — Come, gentlemen, one and all, *we will not go up* to this *Moses* who sends for us, we will assert our *rights and liberties*! what! does he think that all this *people* were made only to serve his *lusts and ambition*? Were not *governors* made for the good of the *people*, and not the *people* for them? And are not the *people* the best judges of their own good? they feel when they are *oppressed*, and they see the breach of *promises* made to them, and the *arbitrary government* of this *Moses*! Would he persuade them out of their *senses*! he kept them 40 years in going from *Egypt* to *Canaan*, which is a journey but of a few days; and he told them that *God* ordered it so for their *stubbornness*; but they thought that all this was only a *put-off* in *Moses*, and an *excuse* for his breach of *promise* to them, and to keep himself in possession of the *government* over them. Nay, all those to whom the *promise* of possessing *Canaan* was made, they all died in the *wilderness* (except *Caleb* and *Joshua*) and never saw the performance of it, which was made good only to their children.

6. R. And can Mr. Hoadly name any other case where people had more reason to complain of breach of *promise*? or where they asserted it with greater *positiveness*? if he cannot, he must find out a new *hypothesis* to serve his purpose.

Wednesday, May 5, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 320.

1. The instance given of *Moses* comes up to all the *salvoes* for *resistance*.
2. Objection, That *Moses* being divinely inspired, with power of *miracles*, &c. is not the case as to ordinary governors.
3. Answer, This makes the *argument* stronger against *resistance*.
4. They denied that *Moses* wrought his *miracles* by *God*.
5. The imaginary *designs* of governors, the chief cause of *jealousies* and *fears*.
6. The people commonly love *oppressors* of their own making. The mildest *princes* are worst used by them. Mr. Hoadly must tell *Who shall be judge?* or give up the *cause*.
7. Some of the people always on the side of *oppressors*.
8. Men may be *slaves* and not know it.

1. Coun. **T**HE last instance you gave, *master*, of the *pretences* of the *Israelites* against *Moses* came up full to all the *salvoes* that are or can be alledg'd in favour of *resistance*. For the case was said to be as plain as possible, so that he must put out all their eyes if they did not see it. And it was of the last consequence, as was pretended, to kill us in the *wilderness*, not only the encroaching upon *laws*, and endangering the *constitution*, but their very *lives* was the case, to kill us all — There can be no *aggravation* of any case beyond this.

2. But yet an answer has been given me to this. They say, that the breach of *promise* alledged against *Moses*, of keeping them so long in the *wilderness*, and not giving them possession of *fields* and *vineyards*, &c. was really and truly the act of *God* and not of *Moses*; and that *Moses* did vouch it so to be by many *miracles* he wrought before them, and therefore that this is not to be brought

in precedent as to ordinary kings or governors, who are not acted by the immediate direction of God, but are answerable themselves for their own male-administration and breach of promise to their people.

3. R. This, instead of a *salvo*, pins the basket faster upon the orators for resistance; for if such pretences could be made against a governor of God's own appointment, who was immediately directed by God, and impowered to work such mighty miracles in attestation of it, how much more might pretences be made against an ordinary governor, who managed by his own skill and wisdom?

4. But then again, we find that the Israelites did dispute this point, and said, that Moses did these works by some skill of his own, and not by direction from God, as Moses told them, Num. xvi. 28. *Hereby ye shall know that the Lord hath sent me to do all these works; for I have not done them of mine own mind; if these men die the common death of all men—then the Lord hath not sent me. But if the Lord make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up—then ye shall understand that these men have provoked the Lord.* And when they were swallowed up accordingly, *And all the people fled at the cry of them, for they said, lest the earth swallow us up also; yet all this did not remove their jealousy, for it is said, ver. 41. But on the morrow all the congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and against Aaron saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord.* And 14,700 of them were destroyed for this by a new plague before God could silence their murmurings. So that if the people were left to be judge, Moses and miracles would not convince them, for jealousy will have something still to suspect, and still furnishes the worst; nor is it to be cured even by demonstration, for Moses appealed to God and to them, and said, ver. 15. *I have not taken one ass from them, neither have I hurt one of them.* But no matter for that—they still said he was arbitrary, and designed to make himself altogether a prince over them!

5. C. Design'd—there is no end of that—for we may imagine designs to be what we will! that's just according

cording to our fears, or what any body will put into our heads!

R. It is so, *countryman*, and this is the reason why the people are by no means fit judges of government; for they judge not by reason, but by imagination, by fears and jealousies, which any body may put into their heads, and then they are blind, and wilful and obstinate; and when they have worry'd and destroy'd one another till they are weary, they will fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward, as the prophet tells us, *Isai. viii. 21.*

C. But though Moses was not an oppressor, yet you will not say but there have been kings that were oppressors, and have grievously harass'd and tax'd the people out of their skins.

R. And the people generally love these the best—and will call them deliverers too, and saviours of the nation! especially if they themselves have any hand in it, for then they must stand by their own act and deed, and they never judge themselves to be in the wrong! and go through all histories, and you will find that it is generally the mild and gentle princes, such as Moses was, who bear most the strife of the people. And by this example of Moses it is evident, that pretences will never be wanting against the best administration in the world; and therefore, that if people have the liberty of resistance upon any pretence whatsoever, they may resist upon every pretence, for there is no medium; and who shall be judge?

C. You have brought us back again to your old question, *Who shall be judge?* Mr. Hoady must find some salvo for this, or else he must retract, repent, and reform. And this instance you have given of Moses does absolutely prevent that answer, that a case may be so plain, as that no body can doubt, and where there need not be any judge.

But was there ever a case where all the people did agree as to any pretence of tyranny or oppression?

7. R. No, *countryman*, some of the *people* were for *Moses*, though much the *major* part were against him—to shew that the *major* part are always in the *right*!

But, *countryman*, there are some who always find their account in every *tyranny* and *oppression*; and the *instruments* of it will be sure to *justify* it, and call it the *mildest government* in the world. Besides you must suppose that *people* are capable to be *influenced* sometimes on the *right* side, as well as on the *wrong*; so that there will be always a *division* of *parties*, in every *turn* or *revolution*: you see the very *Poles*, the *patrons* of *liberty*, are *divided* among themselves; and the *slaves* of *France* think themselves *free*, and praise their *government* as the *happiest* in the world. I'll warrant you they would not change even with *Poland* at this day! and what's the matter though they have not a *penny* they can call *their own*, while they think it *their own*, and spend it freely as if it were *their own*?

.8. C. Then a man may be a *slave* and not *know* it! Well, 'tis a pleasant *slavery* however! and these are *merry* rogues, they're always *dancing* or *singing*; but if they had a taste of our *liberty*, they would grow as *dull* as we are! for nothing makes a man so *dull* as *liberty*!

R. Then every *cobler* turns *politician*, is *judge* betwixt the *king* and the *people*, the *church* and the *state*, arraigns the *government*, falls upon the *ministry*, calls *generals* and *admirals* to account, and examines their *conduct*, settles the *church*, and cooks *religion*! And these are *serious* things, and would make any one look *grave*! but if a man had nothing to do but to mind *his own* business, he might be as *merry* as he would, and would have fewer things to trouble him. And if this were not *slavery*, it would be a *happy* condition, and better for our *selves* and all the *neighbourhood*, if we could but construe these four words,

*Ne Sutor ultra Crepidam.*

*Sate*

Saturday, May 8, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 321.

1. Mr. Hoadly and the *Review* join together.
2. The *Review* persists in ridiculing the scripture.
3. His arguments answered, whereby he would prove *Reboboam* to be a tyrant.
4. This commonly the fate of weak princes.
5. He would prove *Solomon* to be a tyrant too.
6. Mr. Hoadly shews how the people did abdicate God himself.
7. Of God's forbidding *Reboboam* to fight against *Jeroboam*.
8. How the rebellion of *Jeroboam* was from the Lord.

1. Coun. IF you were not engag'd with Mr. Hoadly, I would desire you, *master*, to give some answer to Mr. *Review*, who has fallen upon you about what you have said of *Reboboam*. And some people may think there is something in it, because you have made no reply to it.

R. That falls in pat with the subject I am upon. And Mr. Hoadly and Mr. *Review* are equal authors in this case of *resistance*; therefore let me hear what the *Review* says.

C. It is in the *Review* of the 3d last month, Vol. V. N. 3. where he says,

"Certainly Mr. *Rehearsal* wanted to make the world laugh a little; first with his tale of God's refusing to let *Israel* go till they had *Pharaoh's* consent; and now with honest *Reboboam*, and his being no tyrant, but "a tender-hearted prince."

2. R. I thought I had cured the *Review* from ridiculing the holy scriptures in his mirth, and calling God's dealing with the *Israelites* a tale, as if I had quoted it out of a *Romance*. The same observation I made of

God's not suffering the children of *Israel* to go out of *Egypt* till they had *Pharaoh's* consent, the *Review* will find in bishop *Overall's* Convocation-book. And does he think that the whole convocation of the church of *England* did weigh and determine of so serious a matter, only to make the world laugh? He made a jest and a merry tale of this before; for which I gave him due correction, and answered all the objections he put as to *Pharaoh* and the *Israelites*! To which he has not replied one word, but comes up again with his merry tale, thinking this piece of profaneness too good a jest to be lost! And to shew that he had no reverence or regard to the holy scriptures of God!

If he had thought of this, it would have stopt his raillery upon me for giving to *Rehoboam* the epithet of tender-hearted, which I only repeated from a text of scripture there quoted.

3. C. But he asks, *Whether Rehoboam's chastizing his subjects with scorpions, did not denote him a very tender-hearted prince?*

R. Where did he do it? Let Mr. *Review* shew that; or else confess, that he has misrepresented the case.

C. But he threatened it, upon which the *Review* asks, *Whether a haughty answer to an humble and just petition of subjects ——— does not denote a tyrant?*

R. The petition was neither humble nor just, as we shall see presently; and though it deserved the answer it got, yet it was not wise or politick at that time, the conspirators being too powerful for him, and not to be frighted with big words, as those young men who advised him foolishly thought.

C. There is a time indeed when the insolent demands of rebels are not to be answered as they deserve. It is like provoking highway-men, and threatening to hang them, when they have you in their hands.

R. This shews the folly, but not the tyranny of *Rehoboam*. Nor are there any tyrannical acts of his mentioned in his reign. It was very wicked indeed towards God: Wherefore God forsook him, and brought many evils

evils upon him, and permitted this *conspiracy* against him to prevail. But as to his *subjects*, the greatest blot that appears in him was governing with too loose a *rein*, and letting them run into *idolatry*, and all the *abominations* of the *nations* round about them, and suffering the *Sodomites* to be in the land. All the effects rather of a *weak* than a *tyrannical* prince.

4. And as I have observed to you before, *countryman*, the *reigns* of *weak* *princes* are generally most *wicked* and *licentious*, and most *rebellions* and *blood* in them, whence the *mildest* *princes* have got the name of *tyrants*; because they who *rebel* must not lay the blame upon themselves.

C. But, *master*, you said, that the *demands* of the *people* to *Rehoboam* were neither *humble* nor *just*. How do you make that out? The *Review* says, *They complained of oppression, explained in two articles, exorbitant exactions and illegal punishments.*

5. R. These were the complaints they made against the former reign of *Solomon*, whom the *Review* therefore makes a *tyrant* too, and says, *Now if these do not make a tyrant, we must indeed be at a loss to find a tyrant in king Solomon.*

C. I never heard *Solomon* called a *tyrant* before. He was the *wisest* man in the world: He promoted *trade* mightily, and made his *people* wondrous *rich*, beyond any *nation* on the earth! He saved them from their *enemies*, and kept them in perfect *peace* and *quietness*. Was this *tyranny*?

R. Yes, *countryman*, with some sort of *people*, as you see now with Mr. *Review*! who takes part with the *mutinous tribes* against such a *king* as this! But neither he nor they have made good one tittle of their *charge* against him. What were these *exorbitant exactions*, and on whom were these *illegal punishments* executed? What do we find of this in all the *history* of his *reign*? But it shews that *pretences* will never be wanting against the best *king* or *government* in the world, when *people* are disposed for *revolution*.

C. This is a flagrant *instance* of it indeed ! And if neither a *Moses*, nor a *David*, nor a *Solomon* will please them, what will please them ?

6. R. Not *God* himself, as Mr. Hoadly has well instructed us, and shewed how the *people* did *abdicate* even *God* from being their *king*. And yet still contends, that the *people* are the best judges of *government* !

C. But the *Review* says, *That God himself owned the people's taking up arms against Rehoboam, and forbid his marching against them.*

7. R. To forbid his *marching* is one thing, but to *own* or *approve* of their taking *arms* is another thing. If *God* had forbid *Rehoboam* to *march*, because of the justice of *Jeroboam's* cause, why would *God* have so wonderfully blest the *arms* of *Abijah* the son of *Rehoboam* in the same cause against the same *Jeroboam* ? whom the *Lord* struck, and he died. The wickedness and folly of *Rehoboam* may be one reason why *God* would not suffer him to do it.

8. C. But it is said, *This thing is from the Lord.*

R. So it is said, 2 *Kings* xxiv. 20. *That through the anger of the Lord it came to pass — that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon.* Did *God* therefore approve of this rebellion of *Zedekiah* ? for which he is so severely censured, *Ezek.* xvii. as I have shewed before. But *God* used this as the means to accomplish his *vengeance* against that wicked nation. So it is said, 2 *Sam.* xxiv. 1. *And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them, to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.* Yet this was a great sin in *David*. To whom he said, chap. xii. 11, 12. *I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and he shall lie with thy wives — I will do this thing.* Did *God* therefore approve of *Abshalom* lying with his father's wives, or rebelling against his father, because it is said, that *God* did it ? Thus it was, that the rebellion of *Jeroboam* was from the *Lord*.

Wednesday, May 12, 1708.

No. 322.

1. How *wicked* things may be said to come from God, or to be God's doing.
2. How this has been *apply'd* among us.
3. The *sermons* of the *Hoadlys* more scandalous than the *Observers* and *Reviews*.
4. Mr. Ben. Hoadly runs into the *mob-notion* of co-ordinate powers in our constitution.
5. Who shall be judge in this case.
6. His mistake of our constitution.
7. A friendly advice to Mr. Hoadly.
8. This proceeds from no *ill will* to him.
9. That God did appoint a particular form of government.

1. Coun. **T**HE last thing you said, *master*, has instructed me very much, and saved me from some wild notions that mislead many people, as if every thing that God permitted were his order and had his allowance and approbation; and they run into this by not understanding such expressions of scripture as *This is from the Lord*, or *The Lord did this*, which often means no more than that God did suffer men to do very wicked things, and by that means brings his judgments upon them, as is very plain in the instances you have given, particularly that of *Absalom*, where his unnatural rebellion against his father is said to be raised by God, and God is said to give him his father's wives to lye with, and that God did this thing. God indeed did permit it, and by this means brought a just judgment upon David for his sin in the matter of *Uriah*. But it would be abhorrent to think, that God did approve of these monstrous sins of *Absalom*! On the contrary, we find that God did severely punish him for them, particularly for his rebellion, in which he died after a very strange manner.

2. And as the *Review* and other sons of rebellion would justify the revolution of *Jeroboam* from its being said to be from the Lord; so do they in other cases, O, say they, *This is from the Lord, it is God's own doing, it is plain from his blessing it with success, and without blood too, like that of Jeroboam!* but it cost blood enough afterwards——— And the more considerate would say with *Jeroboam* 2 Kin. vi. 33. *Behold, this evil is of the Lord.* And some, when tired out, make his inference too, *What should I wait for the Lord any longer?* And we may all say, in a sound sense, *Is there any evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?* And we have deserved more than the Lord hath yet done to us for our many sins, particularly for the barbarous murder of our late martyr'd sovereign, and the present ridiculing it in *calve's-head-feasts*, and more notoriously by the *Review* in his dry and wet martyrdom, and other screech-owls, who maintain the same rebellious principles, and propagate them through the nation, to bring down more wrath from heaven.

3. R. But all these do not so much mischief, nor look so terribly upon us, as when this doctrine comes from the pulpit, when those that teach the people lead them astray, and turn righteousness into hemlock! who put evil for good, and good for evil; light for darkness, and darkness for light. The two Hoadlys have done more to poison the nation than both the *Observer* and *Review*, and their sermons are much more scandalous! therefore they ought to be rebuked more sharply.

4. See how Ben. Hoadly in his *assize-sermon* runs into all the mob and rebellious principles of forty-one, he would have the two houses of parliament to be co-ordinate with the crown. He inveighs against such a monarchy as governs without the restraint of any co-ordinate legislative powers, as he expresses it, p. 1. This is the old notion of the king being one of the three estates, which I have sufficiently exposed already; and if Mr. Hoadly is not convinced, he must alter his *Common-Prayer-Book* (which perhaps would not trouble him much) and next fifth of

*Novem-*

*November* he must not thank God for preserving the king, and the three estates of this realm assembled in parliament; let him say the king and the other two estates——for he would not banter God Almighty!

5. But upon this notion of *co-ordinate powers* I must ask him my old question, *Who shall be judge?* Who shall umpire the matter, if they differ among themselves? And he will not say that this is an impossible supposition, for we have both *seen* it and *felt* it more than once. There was a war betwixt king and parliament in forty-one times, who was judge between them! We have seen the houses of lords and commons differ about their privileges, who is judge in this case? And if there is no *dernier resort*, there is no government; but we must go by the ears——three *co-ordinate powers* are three kings in the same kingdom, and it is not likely they should long agree. Now let Mr. Hoadly see what a confusion he has made of our constitution.

6. But let him think again how he has mistaken our constitution, for our constitution is one sovereign, free from all coercion, by either or both houses of parliament, or by the people either collectively or representatively, or by any other person or persons whatsoever. And the sole power of the sword is in this sovereign alone, and neither or both houses of parliament may wage war against him, either offensive or defensive; neither have they any legislative power without him, or any authority whatsoever but from him, they are his dutiful and obedient subjects, as they stile themselves; then sure not *co-ordinate* with him.

7. Mr. Hoadly, if you know not these things I will shew them to you, I have done it already, do not think it beneath your character to read these penny-papers, as good men have done it, and perhaps they may tell you something you know not yet! and do not run away with these mob notions of government, which you learn in worse company. But above all things do not carry them into the pulpit with you, and bring not the blood of these poor souls that hear you upon your own head, do not do it; consider of it a little better before you venture upon it again,

again, and if you find that you have grossly *mistaken* the matter (and a man of your *sense* cannot miss it, if you consider it *impartially*) then you must think your self obliged to make *reparation* in as *publick* a manner as you have given the *offence*, and *print* another *sermon* to set things right, that you may *die* in *peace*.

8. And take not my freedom with you amiss, you see I was constrained to it, and I had *sinned* too, in my own opinion, if I had not endeavoured to *rescue* those who I saw were *infected* by your *sermons*; and if I gain you too, it is a *labour* of *love*, and you will not be angry with me, I am perfectly a *stranger* to you, and know you no otherwise than by your *printed works*, with some of which I was very well pleased, and the more sorry to see you fall into such dangerous *errors*; and what I now say to you cannot be out of any *personal* prejudice to you, whom I should not know if I met you in the street, or ever heard any thing to your disadvantage, except what you have done upon this *subject*, therefore I ask leave to talk with you a little more.

9. You say, p. 7. " Had it pleased Almighty God to have pointed out any particular form, as of necessity to be submitted to by all nations, I should certainly think that this was the best and happiest that could be devised for the carrying forward the ends of human society."

Now, Sir, I desire you to consider that there was no other *form* of *government* in all the world but *monarchy* for some *thousands* of *years* after the world began; and therefore if God pointed out any *form* it must be this, and this was to be submitted to by all *nations*, if they were obliged to submit to the *form* of God's appointment. And if God did appoint any *government* at all, he likewise appointed the *form* of it, (for which see Num. 134.) And that God did appoint *government*, see what is said under the head *government* in the *Index*, and I cannot doubt but you will be satisfied. I believe you have been *mistled*, and therefore I pray you to *consider* a little. See likewise the word *people* in the *Index*, and I think you will find it proved to a *demonstration*, that the *people*  
never

never did, or ever can choose any sort of government whatsoever; and that if they did, it could have no foundation, but liable to eternal struggle and revolution.

---

Saturday, May 15, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 323.

---

An address to Mr. Hoadly, shewing,

1. How I came to be convinced, even against my interest.
2. How we have taken our notions of government from the heathen.
3. How they supplied the want of divine authority in government.
4. When converted to Christianity they became jure-divino-men.
5. How unreasonable that we should follow them as heathens and not as Christians.
6. That monarchy was instituted as a form to all nations.
7. The wisdom of God justified in this.
8. Even commonwealths stand not on the foot of the people. There never was a popular government truly so.
9. The greatest security of the people is under monarchy.
10. The hearts of kings in the hand of God.
11. No greater security upon earth. The remedy of rebellion worse than the disease of tyranny.
12. We call the first age of monarchy the golden-age.
13. How Mr. Hoadly may be my greatest benefactor.

1. **Y**OU say well, Mr. Hoadly, that if God had appointed any particular form of government, you would certainly conclude it was the best that could be for human society. No doubt the inference is just and rational, and it was this very thought that prompted me to make the most diligent enquiry that I could into the original of government in the world, how instituted, and by what authority. And it was my interest as well as yours, to have gone into the same notions of government as you have done; but the flagrancy of fact from scripture,

## 62 The REHEARSAL.

ture, as well as reason, determined me, against all this *byass*, to that side of the question which lies furthest from the world as to me.

2. For the first institution of government appeared as plain in holy scripture as the creation of man; and the *mob* notion of the independent state of nature (upon which all popular government is founded) vanished as a dream, and a pure figment of *heathens* who knew not the beginning of the world or of man. Some fancied the world to have been from eternity, and fabled *showers* of men dropping down from the clouds, or springing up out of the earth, from dragons teeth, without fathers or mothers, or whatever extravagant fancies came into their heads! and these could see no other original of government but the consent of the people.

3. And then again, because government, in the very nature of the thing, does suppose an authority more than human, for the same power that can oblige, may likewise dissolve that obligation, so that men might ever free themselves from government, if it had no higher authority than that of men: therefore the *heathens*, to supply this, made their kings to have been begotten by some God or other, and so to be above mere human race.

4. But as soon as these *heathens* embraced Christianity, and had the light of the holy scriptures given to them, they immediately forsook all these false and foolish notions of government, whose authority they then saw came from God alone, and on which only account obedience was due to it for conscience sake; for nothing under God can bind the conscience.

Thus these *heathens*, by becoming Christians, became likewise absolute *jure-divino* and passive-obedience-men, and not only preached it, but gave up their lives for it.

5. And how unworthy a Christian and unreasonable did it appear to me, to take the original of government from these wild notions of the *heathen*, that had no foundation, either in fact or reason, to magnify them thus while they were *heathens* and in gross ignorance, and take all our precedents from them; and then to ridicule and ex-

pose them, when they became *Christians*, as a company of *passive obedience fools*, as our modern *wits* call those *antient Greek and Roman martyrs* for this as well as other *doctrines of Christianity*! but recur with *triumph* to their *testimony* while they were *heathen*, and quote them as the noble *assertors of liberty and property*, and the generous *maintainers of the rights of mankind*, in their *original and free-born state of nature*!

This seemed to me a running back from *Christianity* to our *antient paganism* again, therefore I took pains to search the *originals*, and must believe the *history* of the *creation of the world*, of *man*, and of *government*, as it is told us in *Genesis*, which, besides its *authority with Christians*, is the most *antient book the world can shew*.

6. But I know, Mr. Hoadly, you will not deny its *authority*, and therefore speaking now to you, I will say no more upon that head; but it now only remains, whether I have rightly deduced the *fact of government*, which you will find under the proper heads in the *Index*; and particularly, whether *monarchy* was not the *first institution*? and whether there was any other sort of *government* in all the *earth*, till the *mutiny of the Grecian commonwealths*? and consequently, whether *monarchy* was not that *form of government* which God appointed to all *nations*? and whether God did allow men that *liberty* to *alter and change this form* at their pleasure? and, upon the whole, whether *monarchy*, being of *divine institution*, is not the *best form* for the good of *human society*.

7. His *authority* must determine you and me too, but we may contemplate his *wisdom a posteriori*, and see by the *effects*, that he has consulted better for us than we do for our selves. This has occasioned what I have said as to *government* upon the point of *reason* and the *publick good*. I have hereupon discussed the *schemes and pretences of Milton, Lock, Sidney, &c.* who dispute for the *power of the people*; and I think I have fully shewed the *contradiction* that is in them, and their utter *inconsistency* with any *peace or settlement* in the world. And I have  
exem-

## 64 . The REHEARSAL.

exemplified this by the *history* of the *Grecian* and *Roman* governments while under the *power* of the *people*, and brought it down to the like *instances* in later and in our own times.

8. I have shewed likewise, that even *commonwealths* stand not on the foot of the *people*, for there can be no *dernier resort* in that *scheme*; and that the *people* is an uncertain thing; every *party* call themselves the *people*, and the whole *people* can do no act, or ever were or can be truly *represented*. That *government* never fell so low as to return to the *people*, but was always taken up by some contending *party* or other, who subdue the rest by *force*. And there never was a *popular* government truly so, though often so called.

9. That *monarchy* is a greater *security* than any other form of *government* in many respects, chiefly because, though a *king* may be *missed* and take wrong *measures* (to which all *governments* are liable) yet he cannot be *bribed*, or *design* the ruin of his *people*, because it is his own ruin, and there is no *equivalent* for a *crown*; whereas every *senator* may have more given him than his *share* in the *government*, and therefore may seek its *destruction*; of which we have examples in former and in later ages, therefore the *people* can have no such *security* as where the *safety* of the *prince* is wrapped up with theirs, and he cannot hurt them without hurting himself; whereas many, who call themselves *patriots*, have raised great *fortunes* to themselves by the ruin of their country, even to sell and betray it.

10. That God has told us, as a *security* to us, that he keeps the *hearts* of *kings* in his hand, and turns them as he thinks fit. That he gives good *kings* to a good and obedient *people*, and punishes a wicked *people* by sending them an evil *prince*.

11. That this is the greatest *security* possibly to be had upon earth; that where we seek to remedy our selves by *rebellion*, it brings a thousand times more ruin upon us than ever any of mankind suffered by the most cruel *tyrant*. And if we put our *settlement* upon the foot of the *people*,

people, we raise a fund that is *inexhaustible* of misery and confusion, and that can have no end or remedy.

12. Thus we see that God has most *wisely* consulted for the good of mankind, in setting up *monarchy* at the beginning, and in governing the whole world by it for so many *ages*, and has brought us to confess it, while we reckon these as the *golden ages*, in comparison of those of *iron*, when the *mixt* and *blended* governments filled the world with *blood* and *confusion*.

13. I have intirely satisfied myself, even against my *interest*, in the strictest Enquiry I could make into all these particulars, and after putting all the *objections* I could meet with from others, or could suggest to myself. And if Mr. *Hoadly* can shew me wherein I have reasoned amiss, I shall have cause to esteem him as my greatest *benefactor*.

---

Wednesday, May 19, 1708.

Nº. 324.

---

1. The last *parliament* of Great Britain was appointed by *parliament*. This the first *chose* by the *people*.
2. He enters *blindfold* into *politicks*, who knows not the *secret*.
3. Impossible that the *dissenters* can be in the interest of the *church*.
4. Yet there are endeavours to persuade her to it.
5. The monstrous *absurdity* of it.
6. The true meaning of the plea of *moderation*.
7. And of *occasional conformity*.
8. That such cannot be *friends* to the *church*.
9. What a man of *moderation* is.
10. Not so great a *fool* as a *knave*.

1 Coun. **Y**OU are out of fashion, *master*, the town and country swarm with *advices* to the *electors* for *parliament*. This is the time: this is the first *parlia-*

*parliament* of Great Britain that is to be chosen by the people; for the last was chose by *parliament*. And the consequences that depend upon it seem to be very great. And are you *silent*? 'The *Observers* and *Reviews* have been upon it — Have you nothing to say?

2. R. My talent is not in *politicks*. I am for plain *sense* and *reason*, and to discover the *truth* where I can find it. But when you come to *intrigues*, the *designs* and *interest* and *parties*, a man who is not let into the *secret*, shoots his bolt in the dark, and knows not whether he hits friend or foe.

But you tell me something is expected from me on this occasion; that I may not seem unconcerned in the good of the nation. Well then since I must speak, I will deliver my mind in a few words.

3. I know but two things to be considered in this matter; that is, the *church* and the *state*. For the first, every man surely of the *church* of England will choose such men as he thinks best affected to her and to her *constitution*. And for the same reason the *dissenters* must choose such men as are most *their way*, and against the *church*. To say, that the *dissenters* with the *establishment* of the *church*, is what is not in their power to do, or of any man to believe, who has common *sense*. For I could not believe such a *persuasion* to be *true*, if I did not wish it to *prevail*: And that every thing in opposition to it should be removed and taken out of the way.

C. This is so very *plain*, so *necessary*, and so *inseparable* from every man, that it cannot be denied. Are there any that think not thus?

4. R. There are none but must think thus. But many there are who *dissemble*, and endeavour to *deceive* others. How many *books*, *pamphlets*, and *papers* have we seen, and see new every day, to persuade the *church* of England, that the *whigs* and *dissenters* are her best *friends*! And that those of her own *communion*, who wish her *low*, and thence take the name of *low-churchmen*, are her truest *sons*, and that she ought to trust herself chiefly in their hands!

5. C. This

5. C. This is to suppose the *church* bereft of her *senses*! Would I think him my *friend* who would pull me down, and make me *low*! And who would set up my *rival* against me, and persuade me, that all this was for my *good*. That the more *power* my *rival* had, it was the better for me, and I was more *secure*! That he would not hurt me, though he at the very same time used me with the utmost *contempt* and *rancour*, as the *church* is treated by the *dissenters*, (which you have shewed abundantly in the foregoing *volumes*) and that I should *trust* such a *rival*, who not only *threatens* my *destruction*, but who has before *ruined* and *destroyed* me, and still maintains the same *principles* by which he is obliged to *destroy* me over again whenever it is in his *power*! and uses *arguments* with me to help him into that *power* again, to try whether he will use it again as he did before! and which he has *sworn* to do in a *solemn league and covenant*! and which, though he will not yet *renounce*, yet we must believe, that he will not act *pur-suant* to it!

These are *monstrous* things, *master*, and I am amazed what any man can find to say upon such a subject.

6. R. All is included in the word *moderation*, which has been so bandy'd about, that I will say no more of it here. Only refer you to a *sermon* lately printed, entitled *Charity and Unity*, in a *sermon* preached at *Hertford school-feast*, by *Henry Nelson*, rector of *Hunsden*, &c. in *Hertfordshire*.

C. What they mean by it is *carelessness* and *stupidity*, not to see any *danger*, even when it is at the door, nor to put a hand to the *pump*, though we see the *ship* a *sinking*.

7. R. But then they seek to gain you by *occasional conformity*; you see, say they, we can join with you upon *occasion*; therefore have no *ill will* to you, nor think your *communion* unlawful.

C. If they do it for *places*, then it shews how far they can strain their *conscience* to gain *power* to *destroy* us.  
And

And this shews the greatest *inveteracy* in the world, that they will even hazard *damnation* for it.

But if they can join in our *communion* with a *sincere mind* and *good conscience*, upon *occasion*, why do they not keep *constant* to it? Why will they keep up a *separation* for what they may *conscientiously* comply with? For, by their own confession, a *separation* from the *church* becomes a formal *schism* if it be for any thing which we do not think to be *sinful*. And if we think it *sinful* we ought not to comply with it so much as once. So that they are *condemned* every way, and no way to be *trusted*.

8. R. But they will grant me this, that he who goes *constantly* to *meetings*, and but *occasionally* to *church*, has a greater kindness for the *meetings*, and thinks them more pure than the *church*: And therefore is bound in *conscience* to promote the interest of the *dissenters* before that of the *church*. And will the *church* choose such for her *representatives* in *parliament*? You may take it for granted, that whoever *votes* for any such, has no great *good will* to the *church*, or at best is very *indifferent* in her concerns.

9. C. An *indifferent friend* is worse than a *fair enemy*. I may *fear* the one, but I *bate* the other; I *despise* him as *sniffeling* and *insignificant*. And his professions of *zeal* to my service makes me look upon him with ten times more *contempt* and *indignation*, knowing he would not stir a foot to save my *life*. This makes him a *knave* too; it has all the ingredients of a *fool* and a *villain*. And this is a man of *moderation* in the modern language!

10. R. Not so greet a *fool* as you think ——— For we see these *moderate* men take *immoderate* pains on the *moderate* side. Mark them ——— They preach *moderation* only to the *church*, but not a word of it to the *dissenters*!

---

Saturday, May 22, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 325.

---

1. The description of a *whig* as to the *church*.
2. As to the *state*.
3. Many *generous* and *sincere* men among them.
4. Their *misfortune* in entertaining wrong notions of *government*.
5. They will not let the *last resort* be in *king* and *parliament*. *De Foe* leaps at a *dazie*.
6. Of *conditions* with *sovereign powers*. No *appeal* to the *people* in any case.
7. The *king* and *parliament* may regulate the *parliament* as they please.
8. Our *constitution* is not upon the foot of the *people*. No *law* to this day allows of taking *arms* against the *government* on any *pretence* whatsoever.

1. Coun. **Y**OU said enough in your last, *master*, to frighten any one that wishes well to the *church* of *England* from chusing a *dissenter*, an *occasional conformist*, or a *low churchman* for the ensuing *parliament*.

1. But there is another sort of people they call *whigs*, who keep constantly to *church*, and pretend to be for the *church*, and will *ridicule* the *dissenters*. What say you as to these, *master*?

R. A true *whig* is for *religion* a *deist*; he will own a *God*, but banters *revelation*: he believes no *church*, but complies with any is in *fashion*; and will overturn one *church* and set up another, as he thinks it serves his *interest*, his *ambition* to be the *head* of a *party*, or whatever other *politicks*, or sometimes even for his *diversion*, and to shew what he can do. And such a man must be a *trusty guardian* for any *church*.

2. C. But how is he as to the *state*? he may be a good *commonwealth's* man for all this.

R. Yes! he is all *commonwealth*, that's the *government* he likes best; he's for the power of the *people*, and is always drawing new *schemes* of *government*, and can find none would not *hang* himself in half a year; for he can be content with none, because none of his contriving will answer the end he proposes, and therefore he is for *overturning, overturning, overturning*——

C. Then he's as dangerous in the *state* as in the *church*, he loves *revolution*, and hates *hereditary* government, because it is *settlement*; and the *worse* title the *better* king with him, because it keeps the king more at the mercy of the *people*, and makes way for new *changes*.

3. R. And yet he may think these *changes* for the better, and really may *design* what he thinks most for the *publick* good; and many of them endeavour after in good earnest, and do many *generous* and *popular* things; and are men of *probity* and *honour*, and *sincere* in what they profess, and have many *noble* and *lovely* qualities, as the *patriots* among the *Greeks* and *Romans*, who durst even *sacrifice* themselves for their *country*.

4. But their misfortune is the not rightly understanding the nature of *government*, its *original*, and the obligation of *conscience* to it, as to *God* and not to *men*. This was pardonable in the *heathen*, who had not the light of the holy *scriptures* to instruct them in the *original* and *obligation* of it. And our *whigs* not consulting the *scriptures* in this case, or little regarding them, have fallen into the error of the *heathen*, of placing *government* upon the foot of the *people*, and in that frame can find no *end* or *last resort*; but every man makes himself judge, and nothing can follow but eternal *confusion*. And let a man act never so *sincerely* and *generously* upon these *principles*, yet all must be *confusion* still; for the best *workmen* can never *build* without a *foundation*; and the *people* could never be the *foundation* of *government*, or can be the *last resort* in any disputes about it, or indeed about any thing else; which I think I have made fully appear past any possibility of a reply. This was the work I first engaged in, and hope I have performed.

C. They

5. C. They say our *constitution* is upon the foot of the *people*, and yet we have a *last resort*; that is, the *king* (or *queen*) and *parliament*; there is an end of all disputes; there is no appeal from that *authority*.

R. Yet all our *popular orators* do appeal from it; they tell you of an *authority* that is *superior* to it, which did *constitute* it, and may *limit* it, or *dissolve* it, that is, the *people*. Hence *De Foe* threatened the *parliament* with the *magazine* of *original power*; and his *colleague* *Mr. Hoadly*, in his *affixe-sermon* (as I have before quoted him) tells you, p. 9. "That property is such a possession of what we call our own, as cannot be shaken by any humour or arbitrary will of one man, or society of men." So that an *act of parliament* cannot *shake* his *estate*! he would appeal to his *original of power* the *people*! but if the *parliament* should catch him by the way, they might give him a *draw-back*, would stop his leap to the *daxie*, which the merry fellow said he would hit when he threw himself off the *ladder*; but he stopt short, the road being too narrow. *De Foe* has taken great pains in his late *Reviews* (for the comfort of his dear *brethren* in *Scotland*) to bring himself into this *noose*, and to prove that the *articles of union* have *limited* the *British parliament*, and that the *queen* and they together have not *authority* sufficient to alter any thing therein *excepted*. And he promised to *justify* this to their *faces*; but his *courage* is palled, and I fancy he is *convinced* of his *error*, and will have a care how he leaps hereafter at a *daxie*—

6. C. At this rate it is in vain to make any *conditions* with *sovereign powers*!

R. In vain for their *subjects*, farther than to trust to their *honour* and *justice*; for there can be no *coercion* over the *sovereign*, that would confound all *government*; and nothing can be *excepted* from the *last resort*; for if there is a dispute about it, even that must be determined by the *last resort*. And in no case whatever, or in any frame of *government* whatsoever, can any appeal lie to the *people*; for if *government* were devolved to the *people* it

it would cease to be *government*, it would be perfect *anarchy*, we can have no other notion of *anarchy*.

7. C. But can the *parliament* chuse the *members* for the next ensuing *parliament*?

R. If the *queen* and *parliament* should pass such an *act*, no doubt it would hold. They may perpetuate the same *parliament* if they will. They may do what they please, because the *last resort* is with them. The last *English parliament* did continue themselves to be *members* of the first *British parliament*, if the *queen* thought fit. And the *members* for *Scotland* were chose by the *parliament* there, and not by the *people*.

8. C. Then they misrepresent our *constitution* who say it is built upon the foot of the *people*.

R. Yes, most grossly, *countryman*, as I have shewed you from our *acts of parliament*, as well as from *reason* and *fact*, and all our *histories*, wherein though we read of several *rebellions* raised on this pretence of the power of the *people*, yet our *constitution* appeared to be plainly otherwise, and that these were *infractions* upon it, as being all of them against the known *laws* of the land; and no *law* can be produced in *England* to this day, that allows the *people* to take up *arms* against the *government* on any *pretence* whatsoever.

Wednesday, May 26, 1708.

No 326.

1. Why I speak so late of the *elections*. We ought not to *advise* the *electors*.
2. They are not a farthing the better for it.
3. It is only to please our selves.
4. A sure rule for *elections*. Some go *constantly* to church, and *constantly* side against her.
5. The danger of *spies*, especially in St. Stephen's chapel.
6. A *test* to discover them.
7. Who are against *peace*, and the little hopes.
8. The *few* must overcome the *many*, else we're undone.
9. There will be a *reck'ning*.
10. No *peace* will be *lasting* but what is *just*.

1. Coun. **Y**OU come in with your nine eggs a penny and six of them rotten. You begin now to talk of *elections* when they are almost ever.

R. Then none can say that I write out of any evil design, or to enflame the *people*. I would have *elections* to be *free*; and even *advice* is a *bias*; for it confounds the poor silly *people*, that they know not their own minds! and a cunning fellow may mislead many an honest well-meaning soul! therefore let them take their own way—for is not that the *wisest* and the *best*? Is not the *original* of government always in the *right*? And who shall be judge over the *original*? Who shall presume to give it *advice*? None thrust themselves into the *council* or *cabinet* of *princes* but who are called by the *prince*; and the greatest *wisdom* of the *prince* is shewed in the choice of his *ministers*; and is not the *people* the *original* and *supreme monarch*? yet we treat him as a *child*, and think he cannot govern without our *advice*! we must be *directing* him in every thing! and will not let him have the choice of his own *representatives*! Are not we then

VOL. V.

E

saucy

## 74 . The REHEARSAL.

*saucy fellows to approach our sovereign lord the people with so little respect, and pull him by the sleeve, and toss and tumble him up and down as if we were all jack-fellows well met!*

2. Besides I'll tell you, the time of *elections* is the worst time to give them *advice*, for they are not then at leisure to hear you. Would you *preach* in *Tuttle-fields* upon an *election-day*, to 20 or 30,000 *hollo boys, hollo!* And for some reasonable time before they are all *drunk*, and would forget what you said to them; and they will be as little the better for what I say to them now, for most of them cannot *read*, and fewer *understand*.

3. C. To what purpose then are all these *advices* to *electors*?

R. Only to shew our *parts!* and that we must speak to every thing! therefore I have put in, because I would not be out of good company! but I had rather speak to the *electors* for a *king* of the *Romans*, for they are but a *few*, and are men of *sense*. And at this time it would not be of less *consequence*.

4. C. Let them look to that—But I think, *master*, that in your two last you have made the matter very plain to the meanest capacity in *England*; that for the *security* of the *church* we ought not to chuse *dissenters*, who are professed *adversaries*; nor *low-churchmen*, who are very indifferent *friends*; nor *whigs*, who care for no *church*. And that keeping constantly to the *church* is not a sure mark of great *affection* to her, while they as constantly side against her upon all occasions. *Deeds* shew men more than *words*; I am sure in our own *private* concerns we should *distinguish* men thus; and if we do it not in the *publick*, it is because our concern is but *small* there.

5. R. We are to look to the *spies* that are in our *camp*; they could do us little hurt if they were not always amongst us; and the danger is the greater when they come into our *churches*, especially if any of them should get into *St. Stephen's chapel*; they might there corrupt our *fountain*; and, if they prevailed, establish *iniquity* by a *law*.

C. But

C. But how shall we *discover* such, for all make *fair* pretences.

6. R. I will put a *test* to them against the time comes. You will grant me they are not *flacks* who will not use their utmost *endeavours* to compass what they *pray* for, what the *queen* recommends to them, and *prays* for heartily her self, and has directed all the nation to *pray* for, in the *form of thanksgiving* for the disappointment of the late attempt to invade her kingdom of *Great Britain*, wherein we are taught to *pray* for a *just, lasting, and happy peace*, to the glory of *God*, the honour of our *sovereign*, and the security of his church and people.

C. Ay, master, that would be a *peace* indeed! but when shall we have it? Sure there are none who would not *pray* for such a *peace*, and *endeavour* it all that is in their power.

R. I tell you, *countryman*, there are those who do not desire such a *peace*, and will employ all their *endeavours* to *obstruct* it.

C. What! a *just* peace, a *lasting* peace, and a *happy* peace! would any body be against such a *peace*?

7. R. Yes, *countryman*, and for that very reason, because it is *just, lasting, and happy* to the church and nation! they will be against a *just* peace, who love *injustice* and prosper by it; they will be against a *lasting* peace, who love to fish in troubled waters; and they will be against what is *happy* to the church and nation, who love not the church, and subsist by our *divisions*; and they will be against any *peace* at all, who thrive by the war, and put money in their pocket!

C. Alas! master, now you have quite discouraged me, for now I see we can have no such *peace* till men grow *just*, and prefer the *publick* good to their own *private* interests.

8. R. Or till those who are for the good of the nation shall have the *courage*, though *fewer*, to oppose the many who measure *justice* by nothing but *interest*; and a few that are in the *right* will in time, if they stand to it, by the blessing of *God*, gain the majority on their side,

## 76 . The REHEARSAL.

unless *God* has determined our *destruction*, and as a preparative to it has *infatuated* us, that we see not the things which belong to our *peace*.

9. C. I have often heard that *honesty* is the best *policy*; and that though *God* suffers *wickedness* for a time, yet he will not let it go *unpunished*.

R. 10. There is nothing *just* but what is according to the rule of *doing to others as we would have them do to us*; nor can we expect any *peace* to be *lasting*, that is not built upon the true *foundation* of the *law of God*, and the known *laws* of the land, pursuant to it. Any other *peace* is but a *seed-plot* for new *wars*; and may *God* scatter those that delight in *war*, and send us, in his good time, a *just, lasting, and happy peace*, to the glory of his name, the honour of our sovereign, and the security of her church and people.

---

Saturday, May 29, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 327.

---

1. The good of one sort of government ought not to be compared with the evil of another; but the good of each and the evil of each looked into.
2. There must be a last resort in every well constituted government.
3. There is no judge among co-ordinate powers.
4. The difference betwixt constitution and administration.
5. It is treason to assert co-ordinate powers in our constitution.
6. Monarchy keeps its ground even as to administration.
7. Instances of defects in constitution in Geneva, Neuchattel, Switzerland, and Holland.
8. And now at Hamburgh.
9. This began upon some small disputes in religion.
10. Applied to our case at present.

1. *Reb.* I Have not been far from Mr. Hoadly all this time, though I named him not; I have one word more to him and others who would judge rightly of this

important subject of *government*, which is, that in the comparison betwixt *monarchy* and *commonwealth* they would lay the *good* of the one against the *good* of the other, and so the *evil* or inconveniences they apprehend in the one, with the *evils* in the other.

C. This is most just, if we would make a right *comparison*; but this has not been observed in any of our popular *declamations* against *tyranny*. by which means we *countrymen* have been mightily imposed upon; for out come *pamphlets* and *sermons* which paint in tragical colours the terrible effects of *monarchy*, in having all depend upon the will of one man, who may *roast* and *broil* us, ravish our *wives* and *daughters*, and take the *beef* out of the *pot*!

But then they do not lay over against this the ten times greater *evils* that are the consequences of *lawless confusion*, where there are ten thousand *tyrants* instead of one, and our *beef* and our *bacon*, our *wives* and our *daughters*, nay, and our *throats* too, lie all at the mercy of *mob* our neighbours, of *porters* and *carmen*, and all the *rascality*.

Our popular *orators* say nothing of this, but over against the *evils* that may befall in *monarchy* they lay before us the *advantages* only they suppose in the *commonwealth* frame, as of living every man under his own vine, of having every thing managed, and laws made by our own consent, &c.

2. R. I have shewed before that as great *security* (and greater) is to be had under *monarchy* for our *lives* and *liberties*, as under any other *form* of *government*; for that all *government* must be *absolute*, *arbitrary*, and *despotick*, in some hands or other, that is, wherever the *last resort* is placed.

C. But may there not be a *government* without this *last resort*? because, as you say, it must be *arbitrary*?

R. The end of *government* is to put an end to *debates*, and without a *last resort* there can be no *end*, and consequently no *government*.

## 78 . The REHEARSAL.

3. C. How will Mr. Hoadly's notion of *co-ordinate* powers in the same government consist with this?

R. It is utterly *inconsistent*, for there is no judge betwixt *co-ordinate* powers, and therefore the *last resort* must be the *sword*, as appeared in the rebellion of *forty-one*; for who was judge betwixt king and parliament? or betwixt the two houses of lords and commons? And thus it was in the Roman state. Who was judge betwixt the tribunes of the people and the patricians? or betwixt either or both of them and the senate? therefore the end was confusion and civil war.

4. C. There may be confusion and civil war too in monarchies.

R. Not by the constitution, for there the *last resort* is fixed, and who will not submit to it are rebels. But in a government by *co-ordinate* powers there may be confusion even by the constitution, and the constitution, it self is confusion, because there is no *last resort*.

C. Then we must make a difference betwixt the constitution and the administration in any government.

R. Yes, countryman, the difference is very great; there will be *male administration* in every government while it is in the hands of men, and in every sort or species of government, for none are free from it. But an error in the constitution is fatal, because it admits of no remedy, nor can be amended, without altering the constitution. And such is the notion of *co-ordinate* powers, to which Mr. Hoadly would reduce our constitution; but I have vindicated it from his objections, and shewed him our laws which recognize the sovereignty in the crown, free from all coercion, either by parliament or people.

5. C. This then is our constitution; and who would set up any power *co-ordinate* with the crown, would overthrow our constitution. And is not this treason?

R. It has all the treason in it that is possible, and flies openly in the face of all our laws. And it is likewise contrary to common sense and reason, for it would set up a government where there is no *last resort*.

6. C.

6. C. You have certainly the better of Mr. Hoadly (if I can judge) as to the point of *constitution*. But now as to the *administration*, will not he make reprisals upon you, and shew how *monarchs* are *ambitious*, and would enslave their neighbours, and make *conquests* for their glory!

R. Did any ever do like the *commonwealth* of Rome? And did not the *Grecian commonwealths* do it, as far as in their power? And have not all *commonwealths* done the same? Do not they make *wars* as well as *princes*? so that even upon the point of *administration* Mr. Hoadly will find no great advantage in this case.

7. C. Our news told us lately of a dispute at *Geneva* betwixt the *magistrates* and *burghers* about their *rights* and *privileges*, and another at *Neuschattel*, where one *town* would not agree with the rest, and their *last resort* was armed *troops* to force them to comply. And the *cantons* in *Switzerland* were like to go by the ears upon the like occasion. And some *towns* in *Holland* were lately *convinced* by the like *argument*.

8. R. There is another instance just now before us at *Hambourgh*, whither troops of *Sweedes*, *Saxons*, *Prussians*, and *Hanoverians* are marching to shew them the *last resort* in a dispute betwixt the *authority* of their *magistrates*, and the *privileges* of the *burghers* and *people*.

9. C. And this dispute began by a difference of two of their *ministers* upon some points of *religion*, and the *magistrates* and *burghers* took part some with the one and some with the other, till at last the *controverisy* turned to their *civil rights*, of which they having no *judge* by their *constitution*, their neighbours are forced to bring the *argument* of *artillery* to quiet them.

R. 10. The like difference in *religion* turn'd *Britain* once before now into an *aceldama*; yet we see no harm in it! though it is already come to touch our *civil rights*, and we see *low-church* joined in *confederacy* with *whigs* and *dissenters* (*Gabal* and *Ammon*, and *Amaleck*) to misrepresent our *constitution*, and set up the same pretence of *co-ordinate powers* which began the *rebellion* of *forty-one*,

wherein they cry'd, as some do now of *high-church*, to make it *low*,

*Down with it, down with it, even to the ground.*

---

Wednesday, June 2, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 328.

---

1. Short answers *Shew me a better.*
2. Easier to suppose one man good than five hundred.
3. A king cannot betray, a senate may.
4. Errors in administration ought not to be charged upon the constitution.
5. Better one devil than a thousand.
6. Legion is a nest of devils all co-ordinate.
7. Why I make a devil of Mr. Hoadly.
8. He makes a *whig* of St. Paul, and a *sin* not to rebel!
9. And with *De Foe*, that all rebellion is the inspiration of God!
10. He would draw in St. Paul to this confederacy.
11. He infers the forfeiture of authority from the description of the duty of rulers. This would unbinge the world.

1. Coun. **Y**OU have taught me, master, to give short answers, it is the best way, and stops disputing; therefore when our popular orators fall upon me, and lay out the inconveniences of monarchical government, I cry, *Shew me a better.* Then we come to comparing, and I keep close to the rule you gave me, and when they paint out the tyranny that may be in monarchy, I shew as great tyranny in the commonwealth frame, as great arbitrariness and absolute administration; and ten thousand times more if the people govern, for that is every body and no body, it is anarchy and confusion, and puts me in the power of every man I meet. There is a general liberty, but it is the most terrible slavery to every particular.

2. Then when they suppose the administration in a commonwealth to be in the hands of all good men; I say, it is easier to suppose one man to be good than five hundred,

*dred, and interest binds the one to look to the publick good more than any of the five hundred; besides the different debates and parties may be amongst even good men, who may not be all of the same judgment or opinion.*

3. Thus I keep them close to your rule of comparing the *good* of the one with the *good* of the other, and the *evil* of the one with the *evil* of the other; and as a *good king* is the happiest government in the world, so an *evil king* is not so bad as an *evil and corrupt senate*, who are always managed by a few that may betray and sell the nation (as many of them have done) for their own particular advantage; which a king cannot do, because there is no equivalent for a crown.

4. Then I come upon them with my reserve, that in the comparison they would make a difference betwixt the evils that come from the administration, and the evils that follow from the constitution. None can follow from the constitution in monarchy, but many may, and even must, among co-ordinate powers, between whom there is no judge.

This lays them flat upon their back, and I have met with none yet that have a word to say after this.

5. R. I am glad to see you take the matter so right, countryman; and now by way of short answers, I'll tell you what befel betwixt me and a stout *whig* t'other day. He was painting out a tyrant in most hideous colours to some mob who were present; I told him he should have leave to make a tyrant as bad as ever he could, and I would undertake the comparison with him after all that. Will you? said he; then a tyrant is a wolf. He shall be a wolf, said I. Nay, said he, he is a lion, a bear. He shall be both, said I, have you any worse to say of him? Yes, said the whig, he's a very devil. He shall be a devil, said I. Now have you any more to say? And what can be worse than the devil? Said he, can you find any thing worse? Yes, says I, I can. At which mob shouted for victory! and cry'd, what can be worse than the devil?—Hell broke loose, said I, for there are ten thousand devils about your ears. Which then is best, monarchy or

*mob?* To which said *wbig*, the *devil* put that into your head; and so we parted, and left *mob* a *gaping*!

6. C. This is the *devil* the *wbigs* have called themselves very properly, and threatened a late *parliament* with him. His name is *Legion*, Anglice *mob*, and Mr. *Hoadly* is his *orator*. He is now entered into the *berd* of *swine*, and hurries them down the *precipice* of the power of the people into the ocean of *confusion*!

R. I know not whether Mr. *Hoadly* can find his *co-ordinate powers* in this *legion*. It is a *mob-devil*, a *nest* of *devils*, all *co-ordinate*!

C. You make a perfect *devil* of Mr. *Hoadly*.

7. R. Why should not I make a *devil* of him, as well as he make a *devil* of all *kings* and *queens*, and puts *co-ordinate powers* upon them, and makes himself *judge* over them all! and if they govern not to please him, he declares their *thrones* to be *vacant*, and to be disposed of by *legion*! and which is worse, he puts all this upon St. *Paul*, and makes *God* the *author* of *confusion*!

8. His *sermon* before the lord *mayor*, &c. *Sept.* 29, 1705, was re-printed in *octavo*, together with his *defence* of it, which he calls *The Measures of Submission*, &c. in the year 1706, where he explains St. *Paul* into a pure *wbig*, and says, that when he calls the *king* the *minister* of *God*, Rom. xiii. 4. he means it only of a *king* who governs well (of which by the way Mr. *Hoadly* and every one of the *mob* is *judge*) unless (says he, p. 26; 27.) he mean the *minister* of *God*, as *Judas* was in betraying our *Saviour*, or as *evil spirits* are in tempting men to *sin*. By this Mr. *Hoadly* makes any *king* or *queen* he pleases to think not to be a good ruler to be a *minister* of the *devil*, (and so he calls him p. 114.) nay an *evil spirit*, that is, the *devil* himself, and as such to be *resisted*, and that it is a *sin* not to *resist* him, and makes us answerable for all the *evils* he does; for (says he, p. 8.) it is a *tacit consent* to the ruin and misery of mankind, if we *resist* him not. And he justifies this again, p. 38. and says, p. 40. that such *resistance* is not only *lawful* but *glorious*. And he makes it more *glorious* than to *resist* a *highway-man*, or  
any

any that offers you a private injury. And says he, p. 58. *The injurious person is as much sent by the providence of God for your punishment, as the injurious prince is placed upon the throne for that purpose.* So that a thief is (by this) as much *jure divino* as a prince! And he says, p. 25. that such princes cannot be called God's *viceregents*, without the *bighest profaneness*. And he says, p. 8. *that a passive non-resistance is a much greater opposition to the will of God, than the contrary*; and it is God sure who moves us to do his will.

9. C. This comes fully up to what you have quoted out of *De Foe*, that all rebellion is the inspiration of God! and it cannot be said that people may rebel without reason, because they are the judges, every man is judge, according to *De Foe* and Mr. Hoadly; and though they may act against reason, through misinformation, or the weakness of their judgment, or from whatever other cause, yet the action is legal, as being from a competent authority; and then the people taking arms against their rulers can never be a rebellion (in a bad sense) but the exercise of a lawful authority of the people over their rulers!

10. R. St. Paul was there describing the duty of rulers, that they bear not the sword of God in vain, but to be a terror to evil works, &c. But can Mr. Hoadly find a text where it is said, that if rulers do not thus they ought to be resisted? St. Paul says in the same place, *That they who resist receive to themselves damnation.* If Mr. Hoadly had been his amanuensis, he would have slipped in here, *while the rulers continue good, and act according to law*, for he has put the same exposition upon these words of the apostle.

11. But may not the duty of a ruler be described without inferring the forfeiture of his office for every breach of it? Does a husband lose his authority if he should be cross or unreasonable now and then, and not love and cherish his wife, as he has promised and is bound to do? Does this dissolve the marriage? Such principles would dissolve the world!

---

Saturday, June 5, 1708. No. 329.

---

1. Mr. Hoadly's principles would dissolve all *relations* among men.
2. St. Paul contradicts in terms Mr. Hoadly's exposition of his words.
3. St. Peter comes in to support the *doctrine* of St. Paul against Mr. Hoadly.
4. And our Blessed Saviour in a very *flagrant* instance.
5. His *sufferings* are an *example* to us as to *passive obedience*.
6. Mr. Hoadly thinks that *kings* bear the *sword* of the *people*, which St. Paul calls the *sword* of God.
7. The great *commendations* of Mr. Hoadly's work, and the general *infection* of the *people*, by it, is the reason why I have undertaken him.

1. Coun. IF Mr. Hoadly be a married man you gave him an instance he will understand, when he would make a failure in duty, a forfeiture of authority.

But, master, the same might be shewed in other instances, as of father and son, master and servant, as well as 'twixt prince and people; for the reason carries all through, and, as you say, this principle would destroy all relations of men in the world, and turn us all again into that chaos of the independent state of nature, which wobigs have fancied, and would make the original of government!

2. R. If St. Paul meant, that obedience was due to rulers only while they were good, and acted according to law, how came he to blame himself for speaking disrespectfully to the high priest for commanding him to be smitten contrary to the law? Act. xxiii. 3. and applied to that unjust ruler the command Exod. xxii. 28. Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor curse (or speak evil of, as St. Paul words it) the ruler of thy people.

C. Here

C. Here is a direct answer in terms to Mr. Hoadly. He says we ought to *resist* a ruler, if he commands any thing *contrary to the law*; St. Paul says, we ought not so much as *speak evil* of him, though commanding *contrary to the law*.

3. R. How will Mr. Hoadly solve those other texts of St. Peter, of submitting not only to the good and gentle, but also to the *froward*? That if we are buffeted for our faults and take it patiently, what glory is it? But if, when we do well, and suffer for it, we take it patiently, this is acceptable with God? Can it be acceptable with God to take these *wrongs* patiently from wicked rulers, if, as Mr. Hoadly says, we ought in conscience to *resist* them, and *sin* if we do not? Was not Christianity a good work? And did not the heathen emperors in St. Paul's time persecute this good work, and were a terror to it? What did he then mean by saying the rulers are not a terror to good works? Was it what they then were? Or was it what they ought to be, and what was incumbent upon their office? And the worst rulers are a terror to many evil works, and encourage many good works, and St. Paul says of them, *They who resist them shall receive to themselves damnation*? But Mr. Hoadly says, that St. Paul meant, *They who resist them not* (when they can) *shall receive to themselves damnation*. A good commentator! for he makes those subjects which do not resist them to be partakers of their wickedness, and answerable for their persecution, in not resisting it, and rescuing the poor people from under it, whenever it is in their power; for that such rulers have no authority from God, but from the devil!

C. St. Paul says, these higher powers are the ordinance of God. Not so, says Mr. Hoadly, but of the devil.

R. He meant of the people! whose ordinance he thinks all kings are.

C. And does he call the people the devil? his own dear original of government!

4. R. Our Blessed Saviour told Pilate, that the power he had over him was given him from above. Did he mean

mean from the *devil*? Or was *Pilate* exercising his power *justly*, when he was passing sentence upon *Christ*, whom he had declared to be *innocent*, even according to the *Roman law*? And *Christ* was able to have *resisted*, he could have had *more than twelve legions of angels* to have *defended* him; but he suffered “as an example to us that we should follow his steps, in not reviling again when we are reviled, nor to threaten when we suffer, but to commit our selves to him who judgeth righteously, even though we were as innocent as he was, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.”

5. C. This of *Christ*'s suffering as an example to us, is of great consideration, for the common answer to his not *resisting* was, that he came to fulfil the work of our redemption, which could not be without his suffering, and therefore that he would not *resist* the powers that condemned him. But this could be no example to us, if this was the only consideration, nor can we follow his steps in this. And the apostle applying it to our suffering patiently though *wrongfully*, under a lawful authority; and *Christ* himself owning that authority which condemned him to be from *above*, detects with a *sun-beam* that *senseless* as well as *wicked interpretation* Mr. Hoadly gives of the words of St. Paul.

6. R. St. Paul says, that the king beareth the sword of God, to execute *vengeance* (which belongeth only to God) upon him that doth evil. But Mr. Hoadly thinks it is the sword of the people that the king bears, and that all his authority is derived from them, and consequently forfeitable to them, and the king accountable to them! and that they have ordained two other powers or estates to be co-ordinate with him, and as a restraint or balance upon him, with power to *coerce* him if he does amiss; and that the people may, nay ought to *coerce* him and them too, if they do not right, and that the people are the proper judges over both king and parliament, every one of the people. This brings it to Mr. Hoadly himself, and then, as I said, he may *dethrone* any king or queen, and fill the throne with himself, if he can get it, or put his wife there, or who else he pleases.

7. C.

7. C. You make his *principles* very ridiculous. And yet it is the very same he has been *preaching* to the Lord mayor and aldermen, to judges and juries at *assizes*, and prints them to *poison* the nation, and dispose them to rebellion. And I have heard his *performance* herein mightily commended, and said to be *unanswerable*, and that he has untied the knot, as to government, better than any before him, and given a fair and clear exposition of the *xiii*th to the Romans; so that there remains now no doubt or difficulty at all, as to the original power of the people; and that the liberty and property of the subject is truly stated, and fully secured by him; as likewise the right of the sovereignty, and its due limits.

R. For all these reasons I have undertaken him, and to save the unthinking part of the people from his infection, who are not capable of long and elaborate discourses; but will understand plain sense familiarly expressed, and short.

---

Wednesday, June 9, 1708. No. 330.

---

1. The *Observer* calls me again to the elections.
2. Yet I leave not Mr. Hoadly.
3. A full answer to the *Advice to the Electors* in England.
4. The *Observer* puts an objection as to the electors in Scotland. And the power of parliaments there.
5. Shewed to be the same in England. His argument would overthrow the union, and bring on new *Revolutions*. The Lord bishop of Sarum expressly on my side against him.
6. His *angel* of *Jura populi anglicani*.
7. He repeats the objection without taking notice of my answer.

1. Coun. **I**T is a long time, master, since you have had a dash with Mr. *Observer*. He is sometimes

times a man of *sense*, and goes not in the *brutal* way of old *Tutchin*. Cannot you leave Mr. *Hoadly* a little, and speak to the *Observer*? Now especially at the time of *elections*, upon which subject he has spent many *papers*?

2. R. I told you before, that it is as well to speak to *elections* when they are over, as for any good it does to the worshipful *electors*. But the *Scotch elections* are not yet over, and the *Observer* lays stress upon them, and I will to gratify you, *countryman*, speak a word to him. And this will not be leaving Mr. *Hoadly* one bit; for the same *principles* are maintained by both.

3. But before I begin with them, I will give a short answer to an *Advice to the Electors in England*, wrote, as I am told, by a person of *quality*, and of good *sense* too. He writes *artfully*, but fails in his *sincerity*. He puts upon *highchurch* all that the *whigs* and *dissenters* have done; that is, of joining with the *papists* against the church of England. It is well known, that before the *popish* lords were excluded the house of *peers* in the reign of king *Charles II.* they caballed with the *whigs*, and we can tell their *meeting-places* at the house of Sir *J— B—* And these practices was one cause of their being removed from their *seats* in *parliament*. And the general silence of the *dissenters* in the reign of king *James II.* as to *popery*, when the church of England stood in the gap; and their flaming *addresses* for that *toleration* which included likewise the *papists*; and their being made *regulators* of the *corporations* all over England, in order to have the *penal laws* and *test* taken away, while those of the church of England were put out of *places* to make room for *whigs* and *dissenters*; these things shew who were doing the business of *popery*. And in the late *elections*, it is still before our eyes, that the *papists* generally through England employed their interest for the *whigs* and *dissenters* against those of the church of England, of which I took notice in the foregoing *Volumes*, being at that time. So that if you will but change the names of *churchmen* and *whig* in this *Advice to the Electors*,

ters, you will find it all truth; that is, the direct contrary to what is there said.

4. C. I hope this will open the eyes of people to see how grossly they are imposed upon. But now, *master*, as to the *Observer*, in that of the 19th last month, Vol. VII. N. 27. he puts an *objection* as to the *practice* of the parliaments of Scotland; where, says he, "They tell me, it was a received doctrine, that the members, when chosen, had a full power to do what they thought fit, without any regard to the instructions of those who chose them; and that while the parliament continued, they looked upon the people to be intirely divested of their power till a new choice."

Then he takes pains to prove, that it was not so in Scotland; and if it had been so, yet that it was otherwise in England.

5. R. It was never otherwise in England, nor in Scotland neither, nor indeed can be. What! take *instructions* from their *electors*! Why? the greatest part of the *electors* (in *Tuttle-fields*, for example) know not what *instructions* mean. They are a mere *caput mortuum*, fit judges indeed, and *statesmen* to give *instructions*! Why were not they consulted about the *union*? Half of them would have taken it for an *onion*, and voted it into their *pottage*? Pray tell me, Mr. *Observer*, (whoever you are) do you think that the *people* gave such full power to any *parliament*, as to *chuse* the next *parliament* for them, and to *vote* that this *present parliament* shall be the next *parliament* without any alteration? Or that the *present parliament* shall *chuse* all the *members* for the *ensuing parliament*, without any intervention of the *people* at all, as was done in Scotland upon the *union*? You will find this question hard to answer upon the foot of the *parliament* deriving their authority from the *people*. Especially considering, that the *parliament* in Scotland, upon the *union*, received *instructions* upon *instructions* from their *electors* against it, with which our *news-papers* here were full at that time. And these *instructions* and *protestations* of their *electors* against the *union*, and de-  
clarin

claring it *null and void*, if done by their *representatives* against their *consent*, were read in the *parliament*, as you know *addresses* are to *princes*; and they weigh'd just as much and were put to the same *use*! Now upon the foot of *power* in the *people* (which I have *exposed* and made *ridiculous*) here will be an eternal *fund* to *question* the *validity* of the *union*. And none can be thought *friends* to it, who set up this *power* of the *people*. Indeed they can be *friends* to no *government*, but lay a *foundation* for new *confusions* and *revolutions* to the end of the world. And as the worthy Lord *bishop* of *Sarum* says excellently (which I have done myself the honour to quote before) it *sets every private person upon the throne*, and *introduceth an anarchy*, which will not admit of any *order* or *remedy*. And is worse than *popery* itself, and putting all the *nations* in the earth under the *absolute* and *despotick* government of the *pope* of *Rome*. And he shews, that the first inventers of this *universal supremacy* of the *pope*, even in *temporals*, did it upon the foot of the *power* of the *people*, who had made him their *universal representative*. And that we owe to these our notions of the *power* of the *people*.

C. Then they who set up this *power* are not only enemies to this *union*, but to all *union* or good *government*, to any *peace* or *settlement* whatsoever.

6. But, *master*, this *Observer* quotes a book called *Jura Populi Anglicani*, which says, *That even a whole parliament cannot lawfully take away the rights of the people*. And says, that the author speaks like an angel.

R. But there are *angels* of different colours! I doubt this was one of the *black* sort! But I can tell him, that whether the *whole parliament* (by which I mean *king* and *parliament*) can lawfully take away the rights of the *people*; yet they can make a *law* to take away any man's right, even to his *life*: and this is *law*, whether it be *lawful* or not.

7. But has he not read my *Rebearsals*? I must suppose he has, because he now and then gives me a compliment

pliment over the left shoulder. And it would not be lawful; that is, reasonable to condemn me without reading what I had said, nor to put the objection again, without considering what I had answered to it.

---

Saturday, June 12, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 331.

---

1. New authors produced, who say nothing new.
2. All borrowed from the puritans in Q. Elizabeth's time.
3. Mr. Hoadly loses the honour of being the first who made evil kings cease to be the ministers of God.
4. Objection against the king being supreme, that he cannot make laws without a parliament.
5. Limitations of concession take not away supremacy.
6. But any limitation of coercion destroys it.
7. The legislature is not shared betwixt king and parliament. The steele and the mill.
8. Not proper to say the king has a negative voice.

1. *Conn.* **I**T is hard upon you, master, that when you have confuted a principle, answered all objections, and made it as clear as the sun, that no body has any thing to say against you; yet the same objections shall be trumped up again, and new authors quoted, saying the same thing that you have answered already, without taking any notice of what you have said in answer to them. Thus Mr. De Foe, after having battled it out with you a long time, at last was forced to give up Milton, Lock, Sidney, and all that had wrote for the power of the people, and to confess that their schemes would not hold water. And now comes Mr. Observer, and quotes his little *Jura Populi*, saying nothing new—An unknown author, when those of greater name had quit the field.

2. *R.* He may quote a hundred more of them; for cart-loads of them have been printed, beginning at Cartwright,

wright, and other puritan rebels in queen Elizabeth's time, whose very words Mr. Hoadly repeats; and their nonsense, as well as treason, has been suck'd in and propagated by their spawn of whigs and dissenters ever since.

But their arguments are all the same. The power of the people! O! the people! the people! They have not found any thing else to say from that time to this. And I having fully answered this pretence, I have answered them all. And they make themselves ridiculous to any judicious reader, when they perpetually repeat what they cannot defend.

3. The same *Observer* we were last upon, of the 19th last month, quotes another author, one *Althufius*, saying, "When parliaments transgress their limits (which no man will say is impossible) or when they seek not the public good of the land, but their own private advantages, they are not, but cease to be ministers of God, and of the people, and become private persons, who ought not, in these particulars, wherein they go beyond their bounds, to be obeyed." This is all that Mr. Hoadly has said. And he must not have the honour of being the *inventer* of that pretty notion, how kings may cease to be the *ministers of God*! But we see what authors he has dabbled with, and whence he has received his instruction!

4. C. You have demolished Mr. Hoadly intirely. And I think you need say no more to Mr. *Observer*, till he can produce something new upon the argument. But I would say a word to you, and it sticks with me: The king (or queen) cannot raise money without a parliament, nor repeal any law, or make a new law, without consent of parliament. Is not this then a restriction upon the crown? And is not the authority of the prince hereby limited? Yet you say, that the people cannot put limitations upon the crown; for this would argue the authority of the people to be superior to the crown. For none can put limitations upon another, who has not a superiority over him; and none who has a superior can be supreme.

5. R. It

5. R. It was not the *people* put these *limitations* upon the *crown*, they could not do it; but it was the *king*, who did *limit* himself in these particulars.

C. How! Can any one *limit* himself?

R. Yes, *countryman*, by way of *concession*; a *concession* is a *grant* or *favour* to another. Thus *God* has, if I may so say, *limited* himself, when he was pleased to make a *covenant* with *mankind*, as that he would no more destroy the *earth* with a *Flood*. And he allows us to *plead* his *covenant* even against *himself*, speaking after the manner of *men*. As *David* said to him, *That thou mightest be clear when thou art judged*. And *St. John* says, *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive*. He is not only *merciful*, but *faithful* and *just* to *forgive*. This is on account of his *covenant* with us in *Christ*. And if *God* can *limit* himself, much more may an *earthly king*.

6. C. But what if the *king* should break this *concession* he has made to us? Then we have no *remedy* but to *compel* him to it by *force*.

R. No, *countryman*, we cannot do that: The *law* has absolutely *barred* all *coercion* upon the *crown*; that would overturn the very *foundation* of *government*. The *king* cannot grant any *coercion* over himself; for that would, *ipso facto*, unking him; and whoever had that power of *coercion* over him, would be *king*, and absolute *judge* when he had *forfeited* his *crown*.

And as it is *blasphemy* to say, we have any *coercion* over *God*, notwithstanding of his *covenant* with us; so it would be a *contradiction* to the nature of *government*, to allow any *coercion* over the *supreme*; it would turn all into *anarchy* and *confusion*.

7. C. I see the reason plain against *coercion*. But does not the *parliament* share the *legislature* with the *king*, seeing no *law* can be made without them?

R. Can the *water* turn the *mill*, unless the  *sluice* be open to let it pass? Is it therefore the *sluice* or the *water* that turns the *mill*?

C. The

C. The *sluce* does not turn the *mill* at all, nor *touches* it; it only gives passage to the *water* which turns it.

R. Yet it has a *negative* upon the *mill*, that without its *consent* the *water* cannot turn the *mill*. This is what we call *causa sine qua non*. A *cause* without which the thing cannot be; but yet itself is no *cause* at all.

C. I understand you: It is only removing an *obstruction* without which the *cause* cannot work. And thus the *parliament* has a *negative* as to the making of *laws*. And is it not enough if the *king* has a *negative* too?

8. R. A *negative* only *binds* a thing from being a *law*. Else either *house* of *parliament* might make a *law*, because either *house* has a *negative*. But a thousand *negatives* will not make an *affirmative*. And there must be an *affirmative* power in the making a *law*, to say this shall be a *law*. And this the *king* only says, *Le roy le veut*; the *king* wills this to be a *law*. And this makes it a *law*; it is his *stamp* which makes the coin current.

---

 Wednesday, June 16, 1708.
 

---

N<sup>o</sup> 332.

1. The *supremacy* cannot be divided.
2. It must be either in one *person*, or in one *body*. All government is *monarchical*. There is no part of a *legislature*.
3. Our *allegiance* is only to the *crown*; and the power of the *sword* only there.
4. Of the *executive* and *legislative* powers.
5. The *distinction* is ridiculous.
6. It sets up co-ordinate powers in the same government.
7. It is contrary to our *constitution*.
8. All *authority*, either *executive* or *legislative*, is derived from the *crown*.
9. None can shew any other *fountain* of power.
10. None can call a *parliament* but the *crown*. The *law* still on the *strongest* side.

1. *Coun.* **B**Y your last, *master*, you think the *legislature* cannot be divided.

*R.* The *legislative* is the *supreme* authority. And the *supremacy* cannot be divided; for it is *one*. There is no such thing as half or three quarter *supreme*. If it be taken down in any one instance, it ceases to be *supreme*.

2. *C.* But is it not divided, when it is among many, as in a *parliament* or *commonwealth*?

*R.* It must always be in *one*, either *body* or *person*. And though there are many that compose that *body*, yet it is the act only of the *body*, as of the *house* of *lords* or *commons*, it is the act of the *house*, and is not considered by the *plurality* of the *persons*, but by the *unity* of the *body*. And he that has the *casting vote*, is, in that, *absolute* and *arbitrary*. So that every government ends in *monarchy* still, whatever *schemes* or *devices* we can find out to avoid it.

I

C. Then

C. Then there can be no such thing as a *piece* or *part* of the *legislature*?

R. No, *countryman*, no more than there can be a *piece* or *part* of a *law*. It must be either a *law*, or no *law*.

3. C. I observe that we swear *allegiance* only to the *king*, we do not swear to the *parliament*.

R. And we swear to him as the only *supreme* governor. He has no *sharers* or *partners* in this. And the power of the *sword* is wholly and solely in him, so that neither or both houses of *parliament* may levy any war either *offensive*, or so much as *defensive* against the *king*, his *heirs* and *lawful successors*, as our *law* words it.

4. C. Therefore they say, that the *executive* part only is in the *king*, but not the *legislative*.

R. And can *treason* be committed against the *executive* part only which is the *inferior* part? For there is no *treason* but only against the *king*. There is no *treason* against *king* and *parliament*, or against the *people*. It is against the *king* alone any man can commit *treason*. If a man offends against either or both houses of *parliament*, he is accused of breach of *privilege*; but there is no *treason* in the case.

5. Besides, how ridiculous is this *distinction*? We pretend it is for our *safety*, that both the *legislative* and *executive* may not be in the same hands, lest such united power might *oppress* us. But if I have the *executive* part *unaccountable*, what care I for your *legislative*? And what signify *laws* if they are not *executed*? And the *executive* may punish contrary to the *law*, and without remedy, if the *legislative* may not call the *executive* to an account. And how can it do that, when it cannot meet without power from the *executive*, or pass any *law* without it?

6. This is the same with *co-ordinate* powers. Here is the *legislative* that is *supreme*, and the *executive* that is likewise *supreme*, and neither of them *accountable* to the other. But if it came to a *dispute*, I would desire to be on the *executive* side, for that is doing, and the *legislative*

*tive* (as these men would have it) is only *saying*, but the power of the *sword* is with the *executive*, and not with the *legislative*; and the *legislative* cannot act without the *executive*.

7. What a *senseless* thing would they make of our constitution? To *divide* the *supremacy*, and make one part *legislative*, and the other *executive*; but the *supremacy* is *indivisible*, and both the *legislative* and *executive* are in it. They are not *two powers*, but a different *exercise* of the *same power*. One to make a *law*, the other to see it *executed*; and the *executive* must *judge* of the *law*. So they are both the same; the *judge* is the *executioner* of the *law*.

8. And it appears in this, that both are derived from the same *fountain*; for as no man can *execute* a *law* but by *commission* from the *king*; so no man has any *vote* in framing of a *law*, but wholly and solely from the *king*.

C. How! have the members of *parliament* their right of *voting* from the *crown*? And have the *freeholders* no other right to chuse *parliament-men* but what they have from the *crown*?

R. No, none at all, *countryman*. Let them produce their *charters*, and see if they have any but from the *crown*. Have they any from the *people*? How came one *borough* to have liberty of chusing *representatives*, and not another? And who *limited* the *votes* to *freeholds* of such a *value*, and *excluded* all others? The *universities* had not the *privilege* of sending *representatives* to *parliament*, till it was granted them by king *James I.* And the *crown* may grant the same *privilege* to any new *boroughs*, or to any other *societies* of men whatsoever. The *crown* alone makes all the *lords*, and may make 500 more if it will. And neither *lords* nor *commons*, or any other within the *kingdom* have any *authority*, either *legislative* or *executive*, but what they derive from the *crown*. So that the *crown* is the *fountain* of all *power*, either *legislative* or *executive*, and therefore must have both in itself.

9. Let these *enemies of monarchy* shew any other *fountain of power* (under God) but the *crown*. They say the *people* made *parliaments*, and *parliaments* made *kings*. But let them shew that *parliament* that made the first *king*, and tell by whose *authority* it was *summoned*, and who appointed the *time* and *place* of *meeting*, and regulated the *elections*, &c.

10. If the same *persons* who compose the *parliament*, should meet as a *parliament* without the *king's writ*, they would be guilty of *treason*, and all their *acts* as a *parliament* would be not only *null*, but *treasonable* by the *law*. And if you or I should *summon* a *parliament*, and they should *meet* accordingly, the *law* would hang us all as a company of *traitors* and *rebels*, unless we got the better ——— And then we would make the *law* hang them who durst *question* our *power*. As *York* and *Lancaster* served one another; and which ever of them won the *field*, never missed a *parliament* to confirm their *title*; for the *law* submits to *conquest*. *Oliver* made the *law* his *hangman* to cut off the *king's head*, and murder the *cavaliers*.

As when the *sea* breaks o'er its bounds,  
And overflows the level grounds,  
Those *banks* and *damms*, that, like a *screen*,  
Did keep it out, now keep it in:  
So when *tyrannic usurpation*  
Invades the *freedom* of a *nation*,  
The *laws* o' th' land that were intended  
To keep it out, are made defend it.

Saturday, June 19, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 333.

1. Why the *avbigs* call me a *nonjuror*? They throw all the dirt in the world upon the *revolution* by it. I will not tell them what I am, since they will not tell me their *authors*.
2. Mr. *Hoadly* lampoons *himself*, by setting his name to his own works.
3. He makes the *revolution* the middle state betwixt *tyranny* and *anarchy*.
4. This no fair instance.
5. He puts the *revolution* upon the foot of *resistance*, for which he is corrected by Dr. *Sherlock*.
6. The late king *James* made no *resistance*.
7. The *revolution*, though a good, yet no cheap bargain. Mr. *Hoadly* must find out some other instance.

1. Conn. **Y**OU have ill luck, master, they take you for a *non-juror*, and turn every thing you say as if meant against the *revolution*.

R. This is only to stop my mouth, that I may not detect the principles and practices of a wicked generation of men among us, who set the world in a flame. But I have already warded that blow, and convinced them (at least all others) that they are those who blacken the *revolution*. If I talk of *Adam* or *Noah*, of the *primogeniture* in those times, or of the *division* of nations after the *Flood*, they say all this makes against the *revolution*! if I quote a text of *scripture*, or repeat the known laws of the *land*, they cry all this is upon the *revolution*! If I speak of *tyranny* or *oppression*, of *rebellion* or *usurpation*, of *swearing*, *lying*, or *cheating*, or almost of any sort of *wickedness*, all this (say they) must be meant of the *revolution*! Now I leave the world to judge, who blacken the *revolution* most, they who apply all these things to

it, or I who speak not a word of it, but discourse in general of *government*, of the *laws of God*, and the known *laws of the land*? And as to the giving them satisfaction, whether I am a *juror* or *non-juror*, who or what I am, I take it not to concern the *cause*; nor do I owe them so much *obligation*. Besides, they should shew me good *example*. Why does not the author or authors of the *book of the Rights* tell us his or their names, and what sort of *folks* they are? who is author of the *Advice to Electors*, and a hundred other *pamphlets* and *papers* that are thrown out in the *dark*? And if we are at *blind man's buff*, why should I discover myself, and spoil the *play*?

2. C. But Mr. Hoadly is not one of these, he sets his name to what *himself* does write!

R. If he had *preached* in a *mask*, I believe he would not have repented it at this day!

C. This is a little *insulting*. Come, leave off your *bantering*, and gird your *armour* close, he has found out what you have so often asked him; that is, a *purgatory*, a *middle state* betwixt *heaven* and *hell*, betwixt *absolute government* and *lawless confusion*. And now you are obliged by your promise to become his *convert*, and to take him hereafter for your *magnus Apollo*.

R. I will keep my promise to him, though he should defeat me, and I will give him a hundred *thanks* for his pains; for he will rid me out of some *difficulties*.

C. Then *listen*, you are almost *converted* already; for a *willing mind* is half the *cure*.

3. In his *Measures of Submission*, p. 79. he comes directly to your question, and puts the *objection* thus:

"The government of the worst of *tyrants* is better than *anarchy* and *confusion*, and the insolence of a lawless multitude; and therefore it is better to bear all oppression than to oppose them."

R. The *objection* is fairly put. I long to know his *answer*.

C. He says, "There would be some colour in this objection, were there no middle condition between  
" *tyranny*

" *tyranny and anarchy*; or were it impossible to oppose  
 " *princes without running into a lawless and ungovern-*  
 " *ed condition. But I see no necessity of any such*  
 " *thing. We have had an instance of a king of Eng-*  
 " *land*" —

And so he goes on to describe very *elegantly* the glory and happiness of the *revolution*, brought to pass by our *opposition* to king *James*.

4. R. This was not fair — We must always except my Lord *mayor*! He supposes me to be a *non-juror*, then it was not *generous* to pinch me here! He knows I must not answer for myself! But I will *ask* the *non-juror* for once, that he may have the full scope of his argument. And now in the person of a *non-juror* I say to Mr. *Hoadly*, that one *swallow* makes no *summer*, and that he does not win except he make good his *leap*; that is, shew some other *example* besides the *revolution*. For if *opposing* of *kings* be so *gentle* and *easy* a matter, that no *harm* comes of it, it is strange it should never happen in the world but *once*! Thus says the *non-juror* in his own defence, and as far as *safely* he may.

5. But now, Mr. *Hoadly*, I have something else to say to you: How come you, with *Observers* and *Reviews*, and the rest of the *mob-authors*, to put the *revolution* upon the *deposing* point? You say, (*ibid.*) that the *nation withdrew its allegiance from king James*, and not only not *assisted* him, but *joined with those who came to oppose him*. And this was before he had *abdicated*. And it was upon the point of *abdication* that the *convention* went, (as all the world knows) and that thereby the *throne* became *vacant*. Your late *patron* Dr. *Sherlock* (who presented you to the parish of *St. Peter's-poor*, but repented it afterwards when he found what *principles* you were of) would pull your ears for this, if he were alive; for he, even after his *conversion*, and in his *reasons* for it, condemns all those utterly who had any hand in the *revolution*, before it was brought about; though he found good *reasons* to *comply* with it afterwards, and got the *deanry* of *St. Paul's* for it, to shew

That his doctrine was approved. He did not put the revolution upon the foot of resistance; but you run in with Tutchin, De Foe, &c. to make it as black as the 30th of January. For which I have given them due correction, I desire you to read it for your edification.

6. Therefore I except against your instance of the revolution, as to the consequences of resistance; for the late king James made no resistance, he fought no battle, but disbanded his army, and withdrew; which the convention adjudged to be abdication. And if a king goes away from his throne, and leaves it vacant, it need not cost much blood for another to step into it, when there is no body to resist him.

7. But it cost some blood in Scotland, and much more in Ireland, where it is modestly computed, that not less than 300,000 souls perished in two years time, by the sword, and the famine occasioned by it; besides the thousands of families that are ruined by it. And if we put into the account our wars abroad ever since the revolution, with all the treasure it has cost, and may cost before we come to the end of it — I say, when all this is computed, the revolution, though it was a very good bargain, yet we have no cause to brag, that it has been so exceeding cheap. But no doubt it was worth all it has cost us, and ten times as much!

R. Mr. Hoadly says in his Measures, &c. p. 83. "That the prospect of being free from the insupportable evils of popery and tyranny are well purchased by this war which hath followed."

R. I dispute it not, though himself says it is still but in prospect; but the evils, the expence of blood and treasure is present, and the prospect of that is not over yet? I wish it may soon. And if a bare abdication has had such effects, what would a resistance have done? So that Mr. Hoadly must find out some other instance to make us in love with resistance!

Wednesday, June 23, 1708. No. 334.

1. The *Review* is convinced as to the false *representations* he made of the *collections* for the *Scots episcopal clergy*.
2. But he has not *retracted*.
3. Why he will not.
4. The meaning of a *scandal* raised upon the lord *archbishop of Glasgow*.
5. That fully confuted.
6. The *presbyterians*, at some turns, disown the *Cameronians*.
7. Yet own them to the height. The *monument* erected for them in the *Gray Friars church-yard*, at *Edinburgh*.
8. The *Cameronians* are the truest *presbyterians*, and pursue exactly *Mr. Hoadly's* principles of government. His opinion of them is desired.

1. Coun. I'LL tell you news, *master*; I hear *Mr. Review* is gone to *Scotland* again, and that since he went thither, and since the *letter* wrote to him concerning the *collections* for the *Scots episcopal clergy*, dated *May 15, 1708*, which has since been printed here, he is now so fully convinced of the false representations he made of these *collections*, that he has owned it in *Scotland*, and in testimony of his repentance has given a *guinea* towards them himself.

2. R. Where the scandal he gave was so publick in print, and the prejudice he raised against these *collections* was dispersed through the nation, the reparation ought to be as publick, and he should have made the same use of his rhetoric to encourage these *collections*, as he did to discredit them. He says, that his pen is lifted in the service of truth, and he often professes how willing and ready he is to retract any error or mis-representation has been made to him, when he is fairly convinced and satisfied of it.

Why then does he not do it now in this case? Why does he not tell us whence he had his *informations*, and expose these wicked men who have misled him to obstruct a most Christian *charity*, and, as far as in his power, to *starve* a multitude of distressed and perishing *families*?

3. C. I can give no other reason but because he has never done it yet——You have detected many false and malicious *stories* he has *printed* with the greatest *assurance*, till he had nothing to *reply*, or could put any *face* upon it; yet to this day he has never had the *grace* to *confess* any one thing, but when he can defend it no longer, he lets it drop. And some time after he trumps it up again, without a *blush*!

R. This is a new *experiment*——But since he will not do it, we must do it for him, to undeceive the world, and let all men see the indefatigable *industry* of a certain *party* among us, who have set themselves in opposition to every thing that is *good*, and daily endeavour to *deceive* the *people*, and lead them into all *mistakes* that may *prejudice* them against the *church* and the *crown*.

The first that was employ'd against these charitable *collections* was the *Observer* revived, whose many falsehoods in fact I have disproved, till I have struck him dumb, and stopt that foul mouth.

4. But there is one thing I have forgot, it is a *story* with which he begins concerning the lord *arch-bishop* of *Glasgow*; I neglected it, it was so *senseless*, and I knew not then the reason of his bringing it in, but thought it pure *slander* for *slander* sake. But since I have seen the *letter* to Mr. *Review* concerning these *collections*, I now see plainly the reason of raising this *scandal* upon the *arch-bishop*; for that *letter* tells us his *grace* is the *president* of the *meeting* of *administrators* for *distributing* these *collections*; and it would be no small *prejudice* to them if the *president* were such a man as he is there represented.

C. Pray, *master*, what is that *story* he tells of the *arch-bishop*?

5. R. That in the reign of king *Char. II.* (as you must suppose) he kept up a *pardon* was granted to some  
of

of the *presbyterians* in *Scotland* who had slipt into *rebellion*, and let it not appear till after they were *executed*, and then made a *jest* of it, saying, they were well out of the way.

C. This was *jesting* with the *king*, as well as with these *criminals*. And would the *arch-bishop* have ventured upon that, and then tell of himself? He might have brought himself in to be guilty of *murder* by this.

But are the *bishops* proper hands to whom *pardons* are directed? I thought that had belonged to other sort of *officers*. And the *king's* letters relating to the *government* were then directed to the *lord high commissioner*, or the *privy-council* in *Scotland*. And did the *bishop* steal these *letters*, and let them know never a word of it?

R. But I'll tell you more, *countryman*; the present *arch-bishop* of *Glasgow* was not preferred to that *see* till the reign of *king James II.* and that *prince* did not *prosecute* the *presbyterians* in *Scotland*, but *indulged* them, and set them up on high, for which they have pay'd him their just *thanks*! And they can name no *presbyterian* in *Scotland* who suffered in that *reign* upon any pretence of *conscience*; unless they think it *conscience* to rise in arms with the *lord Argyle*, in conjunction with *Monmouth* in *England*, for which very few in *Scotland* were *executed*.

C. But these were *martyrs* with them! and they can shew none other in any of these *reigns*.

6. R. When they are told of their *rebellions*, their setting up publick *declarations*, renouncing the *king*, and making it the duty of every true *presbyterian* to *kill* him, and all that adhered to him, or owned him; and in pursuance of it, murdering *soldiers* on the high way, for no other reason but seeing the *king's* livery on their backs; assassinating *bishops*, and such like *godly* deeds! When these things are objected, then they handsomely throw all off themselves, and put it upon the *Cameronians*, a company of silly distracted people, who call themselves *presbyterians*, but are disowned by them.

7. But yet when these furious *zealots* come to suffer the justice of the laws for their horrid *murders* and *treas-*

sons, the *presbyterians* call this *persecution*, enroll them among their *martyrs*, and reckon them their chief *saints*! And this they now dare avow openly and above board; they have lately raised a *monument* in the Grey-Friers church-yard at Edinburgh over those who were executed for their being in actual rebellion at Pentland-Hills and Bothwell-Bridge against king Char. II. and other heinous crimes; and upon this *monument* there is an *inscription* which gives them the title of *saints*, and the names of many of them are inserted, and among the rest that famous *assassin* Mr. James Mitchel, one of their *field-preachers*, who was executed (according to the law there) for his attempt to murder the lord *arch-bishop* of St. Andrew's, in his coach, on the high-street of Edinburgh.

C. Strange! that they should now at this time of day set up *monuments* of their rebellions and murders, and glory in it! one would think they should rather endeavour to conceal these things, that after-ages may have a better relish of them, and these their *saint-like* exploits might come in time to be forgot.

8. R. They will take care they shall not be forgot! what is bred in the bone will hardly go out of the flesh. These *Cameronians* are the truest *presbyterians*, they practice up to their principles; which are the same, as to government, that Mr. Hoadly and other orators for the power of the people have set up here. And Mr. Hoadly cannot deny these *Cameronians* to be *martyrs* and *confessors* to his cause, for he has made them judges when the king has forfeited his crown, and from the minister of God, commences to be minister of the devil, and as such, to be resisted, under the penalty of sin, and our becoming accessories to all his wickedness. I would gladly know Mr. Hoadly's opinion of these *Cameronians*.

Saturday, June 26, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 335.

1. The *presbyterians* in the reigns of king *Charles II.* and king *James II.*
2. The same from the beginning.
3. They tempted the *queen of Bohemia* to rise up against her father king *James I.* and her brother king *Charles I.* and the king of *Bohemia* (her husband) to side with them against *episcopacy* in *England*; with insinuation that they would settle the *crown* upon her and her children, if she would join with the *parliament* against her brother king *Charles I.* with her noble and Christian answer to them; as it is in the papers of her secretary *Sir John Dingley*.
4. Their design to destroy the royal family, by dividing it.

1. Coun. **Y**OU shewed me in your last, *master*, the true spirit of the *presbyterians* in the reign of king *Charles II.* and king *James II.* and in some former papers you have painted them out as to the reign of king *Charles I.* but I hope this is the beginning of your objections against them, and that they were good, honest and peaceable people before that time.

2. R. I have told you, that they were the same from the beginning; for the same principles produce the same effects, as surely as the same tree yields the same fruit, I will not take time here to run over the history of them, that has been very well done by *Dr. Heylen*, *Mr. Foulis*, and others. They began here, under the name of *puritans*, in queen *Elizabeth's* time, but she understood them, and dealt with them accordingly. They were perpetually plotting against her, and, as they have done since, they joined with the *papists* against her.

But there are some papers come providentially to my hands, which tell some particulars that I believe have escaped all the histories of those times; therefore I will

oblige the curious with them, and hope they will be acceptable. What I now present you is,

3. A copy of a paper left by Sir *John Dingley*, sometime secretary to the *Prince* and *Princess Palatine* (called *King* and *Queen of Bohemia*) and written with his own hand. It follows in these words :

“ **M**R. *Macdowel* came from *Groningen*, desired  
 “ private audience of the queen (queen of *Bo-*  
 “ *hemia*) told her that now the king (king *James I.*)  
 “ had sent her brother (*prince Charles*, afterwards king  
 “ *Charles I.*) into *Spain* to marry the *Infanta*; the great-  
 “ est part of *Scotland* gave him as a prince lost in his re-  
 “ ligion, and therefore cast their eyes upon her, and he  
 “ had commission to assure her, that if she would go into  
 “ *Scotland* she would be well received, and make the  
 “ king declare himself that he was a true *protestant*, and  
 “ enemy to *papists* and *popery*. And this he spake not  
 “ of himself, but under the hands of the best in *Scot-*  
 “ *land*. Her majesty answered, That he was mistaken  
 “ in her, that she was confident that neither the *king*,  
 “ who had sufficiently declared himself, nor yet the  
 “ *prince* would ever favour the contrary religion; or, if  
 “ they did, yet that should never move her to depart  
 “ from the duty she owed to her *father*, nor love to her  
 “ *brother*. And though God had deprived the king her  
 “ husband of his estate and honours in *Germany*, yet she  
 “ would never seek to be repaired by such unworthy and  
 “ disloyal means. Adding, that if he would make the  
 “ motion to the king (her husband) she doubted not but  
 “ he would find him of the same opinion. But he  
 “ (*Macdowel*) replied, that because the king was a fo-  
 “ reign prince he had no address to him, but left it to  
 “ her majesty to acquaint him with it, which she did,  
 “ and the king abhorred the motion.

“ Some years after, Mr. *Layten*, leaving his *ministry*  
 “ at *Utrecht*, came to court, labouring to dispose the  
 “ king of *Bohemia* to countenance that party in *England*  
 “ which

" which withstood the *bishops*, forasmuch as the *Palati-*  
 " *nate-church* was otherwise governed. The king said  
 " indeed that government was not established in his  
 " country, but he heard it was in *England*. Yes, quoth  
 " *Layten*, but the godly sort mislike it as tyrannical  
 " over men's consciences. Quoth the king, if I had  
 " found it ratified in the *Palatinate*, I would not have  
 " changed it, nor protected them that withstood it.  
 " Finding there small hopes he went to the queen, and  
 " in her ear told her, he was now going into *En-*  
 " *gland*, and desired her to let him know what comfort  
 " he should give from her majesty to the poor distressed  
 " people of God. She answered, that she knew none  
 " could be distressed in *England* that gave obedience to  
 " the laws. Neither was she able to send comfort to  
 " any, who was comfortless her self.

" Long after this, in the year 1644, came Mr. *Pe-*  
 " *ters* to the *Hague*, and preached wild and unseemly  
 " sermons; he had secret conference with the *prince elec-*  
 " *tor*, and his sister *Elizabeth*, by whose means he de-  
 " fired audience of the *queen* in her bed-chamber,  
 " which she refused, but the *princess* brought him to her  
 " presence when few were by. There he told the queen  
 " how religion lay a bleeding; how the king, by siding  
 " with the professed enemies of true religion, had lost  
 " the hearts of his people; how they were wholly in-  
 " clin'd to her majesty, and she knew not what good inten-  
 " tions were a foot towards her and her children, and  
 " therefore desired her to apply her self to the *parlia-*  
 " *ment*, and give them occasion to do her service, by  
 " approving of their cause. The queen answered, that  
 " she was sorry to see these unnatural wars between her  
 " brother and the parliament, that as she was not able  
 " able to compose the differences, so she wished either  
 " had their rights. For her self, she had lived long in  
 " affliction, and was contented with that estate God sent  
 " her. That she was free from all ambition, much less  
 " would she appear in any action to the wrong or disho-  
 " nour of the king her brother; and she hoped her chil-  
 " dren

"dren would be as well advised; otherwise if they  
 "should engage themselves against the right of her bro-  
 "ther, she professed to become their enemy."

C. But it will be asked, *master*, how came you by these papers? And what proof is there of their being authentick?

R. They were sent to me by a gentleman of worth and credit, and I will read you his letter that came with it, it bears date *January 27, 1702-3*, and according to my careless way I laid it by and forgot it, till rummaging my papers t'other day I found it. The letter is in these words:

S I R,

"YOU must know that the person I lodged with  
 "at *Brentford* was servant for some years to  
 "this *Sir John Dingley's* lady, and at length both of  
 "them dying at her house, most of their household-goods,  
 "and *Sir John's* papers were left in her hands. Mrs.  
 "*Thorogood* (for that was her name) gave me the sight  
 "of these papers, which were letters, speeches, obser-  
 "vations, &c. and amongst them was found what is  
 "above, the original of which is in my custody, toge-  
 "ther with some little more which I think not so mate-  
 "rial of the same kind—I have read so much of *Sir*  
 "*John's* writing that I think I can fairly attest it to be  
 "his hand, &c."

4. C. This is a profitable *discovery*, to be added to the many other instances in *history* of the restless spirit of this generation of men, who leave no stone unturned, or stop at any *wickedness* to carry on their *mischievous* designs. They had laid their *plot* (in order to the *common-wealth*, which they afterwards obtained, but could not hold it) to root out and destroy the whole *royal family*. And as the most proper means for that, to set up one of them against another, and dissolve all ties of nature!

Wed-

Wednesday, June 30, 1708.

No. 336.

1. The design of the *rebels* to have made the duke of Gloucester king, after they had murdered his father.
2. The king's advice to him against it.
3. To *forgive*, but not to *trust* these men.
4. The king presses it upon him as of *conscience*.
5. And *promised* the *restoration* of his son and royal family.
6. The like design they had to marry the princess Anne to some *small country-gentleman*.
7. The security of the royal family in standing all together.

Coun. THESE papers of Sir John Dingley's you shewed me last time, master, are jewels in history, and shew us a sort of *saints* that will rake into bell, to sow discord and divisions upon the earth.

1. R. I will shew you a farther progress of this infernal art, after the times we have been speaking of. When they had brought king Charles I. to the block, before they could form their *commonwealth*, they designed as a shew of keeping up *monarchy*, and to divide the royal family, to set the duke of Gloucester (then a child) upon the throne, with intention to destroy him too, as soon as their matters were ripe; and in the mean time they thought it would cool and quiet the royalists, who might compound for one of the family, the two elder brothers being then abroad, and no prospect of their return. The king was aware of this, and armed the duke of Gloucester against it, as you will find in the following account commonly printed at the end of "ΕΙΣΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ and in the history of the king's martyrdom; which for your remembrance, and the moving expressions that are in it, I will here set down,

2. "A

2. " A true relation of the king's speech to the lady *Elizabeth*, and the duke of *Gloucester*, the day before his death.

" **H**IS children being come to meet him, he first gave his blessing to the lady *Elizabeth*, and bade her remember to tell her brother *James*, whenever she should see him, that it was his father's last desire, that he should no more look upon *Charles* as his eldest brother only, but be obedient to him, as his sovereign; and that they should love one another, and forgive their father's enemies. Then said the king to her, sweetheart, you'll forget this: No, said she, I shall not forget it while I live; and pouring forth abundance of tears, promised to write down the particulars.

" Then the king taking the duke of *Gloucester* upon his knee, said, sweetheart, now they will cut off thy father's head; (upon which words the child looked very stedfastly upon him) mark, child, what I say, they will cut off my head, and perhaps make thee a king; but mark what I say, you must not be a king, so long as your brothers *Charles* and *James* do live; for they will cut off your brothers heads (when they can catch them) and cut off thy head too at the last; and therefore I charge you, do not be made a king by them. At which the child sighing, said, I will be torn in pieces first. Which falling so unexpectedly from one so young, it made the king rejoice exceedingly."

3. In another relation from the lady *Elizabeth*'s own hand she said, " Further, he commanded us all to forgive those people, but never to trust them, for they had been most false to him, and to those that gave them power, and he feared also to their own souls; and desired me not to grieve for him, for he should die a martyr; and that he doubted not but the Lord would settle his throne upon his son, and that we

## The REHEARSAL. 113

" should be all happier than we could have expected to  
" have been if he had lived ; with many other things,  
" which at present I cannot remember."

This was subscribed,

ELIZABETH.

### 4. Another relation from the lady *Elizabeth*:

" The king said to the duke of *Gloucester*, that he  
" would say nothing to him but what was for the good  
" of his soul. He told him, that he heard that the ar-  
" my intended to make him king ; but it was a thing  
" not for him to take upon him, if he regarded the wel-  
" fare of his soul, for he had two brothers before him,  
" and therefore commanded him upon his blessing never  
" to accept of it, unless it redounded lawfully upon  
" him ; and commanded him to fear the Lord, and he  
" would provide for him."

5. C. You have melted me into tears by these relations!  
—O good God! to see that pious king breathing out his  
soul, under the inhuman barbarity of rebellious subjects,  
who usurped an authority to try and condemn their sove-  
reign (and the best ever England had) by virtue of the  
power of the people, that is, as you have rightly ex-  
plained it, of *Belial* and *Beelzebub*—And to see the care  
he took of his children, and thought their souls concern'd  
in preserving the succession—And he was not then acting a  
part, or dissembling with God or man, or could have any  
by ends in it; but having prepared his soul for death,  
(which he was to undergo the day following) he next  
took care for the souls of his children, and to fortify them  
against sin, though baited with the allurements of an  
earthly crown. And how did he prophesy the restoration  
of his son and royal family, then so far out of prospect!

R. You see the design they had in setting up the duke  
of *Gloucester* to be king. And when they had made their

their use of him, they knew how to dispose of him, and make an end of monarchy.

6. C. Their preserving the duke of Gloucester at that time, was like their design in the Rye-House conspiracy, (the account of which I have read) where, after they had murdered the king and the duke, they resolved to preserve the princess Anne; but for what reason? And what was it they were to do with her? As it is told in the said account, and fully proved upon oath, they intended to marry her to some small country gentleman, to keep out foreign pretenders.

7. R. It is well observed, countryman; and we may now see what is the end of all their kindness to any of the royal family! it ends all in commonwealth,——and they play one of the family against another to destroy them by each other; for they otherwise stand so strong, being supported by the law of God, of the land, and of all the earth, that they can hardly be ruined but by one another; and while they are true to themselves, and maintain their succession, they will triumph over all their whig and rebel enemies. But if they prove a house divided——great will be the fall thereof——Then tell it in Gath, and publish it in the streets of Askelon, then let the Philistines rejoice, and the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph! and thenceforward let Great Britain be surnamed Ichaboh!

Saturday, July 3, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 337.

1. I knew not the *author of Jura Populi Anglicani*; and I refer to him to judge of the *law-point* with me.
2. Of our *constitution*, as supposed *superior* to *king* and *parliament*.
3. Of the distinction betwixt the *government* and the *governors*.
4. The instance of *marriage* considered, as to the *choice* of our *governors*.
5. And of the *choice* of the *ministers* of the *gospel*. That the *frame* of the *government* cannot be altered by either.
6. I decline the authority of *Mr. Hooker* in this case, with all due respect to him, and to *Mr. Hoadly*.

1. *Conn.* **Y**OU are called upon, *master*, by the *Observer*, who, in his of the 16th last month, Vol. VII. N. 35. accuses you for treating with contempt the author of *Jura Populi Anglicani*, who he says is a *learned* and *great lawyer*, and is *known to be one of the greatest men in England*.

R. I ask his pardon if I have been guilty of any *ill manners* towards him; for I knew him not, nor do now, otherwise than as he is here described by the *Observer*; and I shall be very glad to be instructed by so *great a man*, wherein I have gone out of the way; especially as to the *laws* of *England*, wherein the *Observer* tells me his *profession* lies; and therefore I leave it to him to judge of those *laws* I have produced, which bar all *coercion* upon the *crowns*.

2. *C.* But in the next *Observer*, N. 36. he comes to the argument with you, and says, *That our prince, electors, and parliaments, have their power from our constitution: And the same laws that limit the one, limit the other.* And this he brings as an answer to your assertion;

tion, *That the free-holders have no right of choosing, nor the members of voting, but what they have from the crown.*

R. Then he supposes, whatever he means, by the *constitution* to be something different from *prince, parliament, and electors*, and superior to them, and prior to them all; because all these (according to his *scheme*) receive their *authority* from the *constitution*. Now he is desired to shew that *constitution* which made *kings and parliaments*; and who made that *constitution*? Or did it make it self? Did it make *laws* before there were *kings* or *parliaments*, by which these *kings and parliaments* should be *regulated and limited*? Or is there any *law* of the land which the *king and parliament* may not *repeal*? How then are they *limited* by the *law*? I desire him to look into N. 136, 139, 140. and there he will see what our *constitution* is.

C. All that he could mean by it is the *original power* of the *people*, and the *independent state* of *nature*; and that you have so *baffled and exposed*, that no body now will venture to name it in express terms, but think that in other words it may pass upon those who do not *think*.

But he quotes the learned Mr. *Hooker*, saying, that all *government* must come either from the choice of the *people*, or the appointment of *God*.

R. Who denies it? This is trifling, and he himself in the same place owns *government* to be of *divine institution*.

3. C. Ay, that is as to *government* in general, but for the choice of the *persons*, that he says is in the *people*.

R. That very pretence is answered in N. 134. where it is shewed that *government* is nothing but the *form* or *species* of the *government*, and the *persons* who *govern*. And if the holy *scriptures* are a good *authority*, I have proved it to a *demonstration*, that *God* did appoint *both*, and that the *people* could appoint *neither*. And I will desire the *Observer* or any others who oppose me, to read first what I have said, and not put me to repeat.

4. C. He gives an instance of *marriage*, which is of *divine institution*, and yet men have liberty to *chuse* their *wives*.

R. Let

R. Let him shew the like liberty given to *subjects* to *chuse* their *king*; the *people* were always *subject*, and the *king* never *dies*, so they are never *free* from his *subjection*. A man may *chuse* his *wife*, but the *people* cannot *chuse* their *king*; for the whole body of the *people* cannot do it, and the whole body of the *people* never were, or ever can be truly *represented*, which I have made very plain; every *party* call themselves the *people*, and the opposite *party* is as much the *people*. The first man born was born in *subjection*, and so have all ever since, so that they were never *free* to *chuse* for themselves. And the ball of *government*, though tossed from one to another, was never let fall so low as to come to the whole body of the *people*, therefore they could never *chuse*, or ever did. Pray, which is the *people* of all the confederated *parties* now in *Poland*? This plea of the *people* is a perfect *jest*, and ought not to be mentioned by any against me, till they have answered what I have said upon that head.

5. C. He gives another instance, the *choice* of the *ministers* of the *gospel* by those who have *authority* to *chuse* and to *ordain* them.

R. And I give the same answer; let him shew the like *authority* given to the *people* to *chuse* their *king*.

But *countryman*, I would ask you one question; tho' you may *chuse* your *wife*, yet can you alter the *laws* of *marriage* which *God* has appointed? If you should promise to *obey*, and give her the *rule* and *dominion* over you, would this stand, by virtue of your *contract*, against that *subjection* which *God* has commanded the *wife* to pay to her *husband*?

C. No sure, we cannot alter the *laws* of *God*.

R. Yet from this supposed *authority* in the *people* to *chuse* their *king*, it is argued that they may likewise alter the whole *frame* and *species* of that *government* which *God* at first appointed, and may frame and contrive what new sort of *government* they think fit; nay, that they may alter the very *tenure* of *government*, and make the *people* judges over the *king*, and he to be *subject* and *accountable* to them!

And

And by the like sort of argument, that the *people* may also alter the *frame* of *church government* which *Christ* and his *apostles* left in the *church*, and set up any new *sort* or *fashion* of *government* they like better. These are the now *modish principles*, and brought to reconcile all the differences about *church matters*! as if that would settle them, and not bring in a thousand times more *confusion* and *distraktion* among us!

6. C. But after this he brings Mr. *Hooker* plum upon you, for the *original power* of the *people*, and joins Mr. *Hoadly* with him.

R. If Mr. *Hooker* says the same things as Mr. *Hoadly*, I must oppose Mr. *Hooker* as well as Mr. *Hoadly*, and desire some *reasons*, besides their *authority*. Mr. *Hooker* was a *learned man*, and I believe Mr. *Hoadly* to be so too, but *learned men* may fall into *mistakes*, and we have many examples. It is long since I thought Mr. *Hooker* to have gone wrong in this matter, and I have seen the *mischief* it has done. He is quoted by Mr. *Lock*, by *Observers* and *Reviews*, and most of the *republican* writers; but I have not attacked him, because of the *reputation* he has (otherwise) deservedly obtained in the *church of England*; yet I would not be misled by him. *Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas*. And I am not taught *jurare in verba magistri*; therefore I desire an answer to what I have said, and not to tell me who is of another opinion.

Wednesday, July 7, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 338.

1. All *civil* power is *derived* from the *crown*. *Authority* only does *determine*; not *law*, *justice*, or *reason*.
2. The *people* cannot *derive* their *authority*. They ever were, and must be in *subjection*.
3. The *Observer* puts the whole in the *commons*, without *king*, or *house of lords*. The *coronation oath* hath no *original contract*.
4. The *modern stile* of our *acts of parliament* explained; *And by authority of the same*.
5. The *ancient stile*.
6. The *king* has more properly a *negative* upon the *parliament*, than they upon him.

1. *Coun.* I Think, *master*, that notwithstanding all the objections of the *Observer*, your position will stand, That the *freeholders* have no right of *choosing*, nor the *members of voting*, but what they have from the *crown*.

*R.* All *power* is *derivative* but *God's*. The *authority* of the *crown* is *derived* from *God*, and from him only, as our *laws* speak, which I have before quoted. And there is or can be no *civil* authority in the *kingdom* but what is *derived* from the *crown*, as the only *fountain* and *source* of all *human* authority. There can be no *co-ordinate* powers in the same *government*, nor *balancing* of *power*; it is all *nonsense* and *contradiction*; it is *civil war* instead of *government*. The *last resort* must *determine* every thing; and it is *absolute* and *arbitrary*, and must be so, in whatever sort of *government*. There is no avoiding it, and there could be no *government* without it. To talk of *reason* and *justice* — that will not do. Go through the world, you will hardly find three men agree what is *just* or *reasonable*. You see, *Mr. Observer*, you and I cannot agree about it; therefore

there must be a judge. And it is as vain to say, the law will determine it; the law never determined any controversy yet, or ever can. It is *nothing*, it is but a *dead letter*, and has no force at all, till it is pronounced out of the mouth of a judge, who is vested with *authority*. And though the judge should decree contrary to the law, yet it is law, and has its full force and effect, till it is reversed by some higher judge, who has a superior authority. And when we come to the *highest*, there we must abide, and the determination is law, though it were contrary to all the written laws in the nation. So that it is *authority* only can determine; and neither law, nor reason, nor justice can determine any thing. They are but words, and have no authority; every man is judge of these, according to his own sense of it; and where every body is judge, no body is judge. Here can be no government or peace in the world: Therefore the people cannot be judge; for that is every body and no body; it is *endless confusion*, which I have sufficiently exposed already.

2. And since all human power must be derived from some or other who had authority to grant it, let the people shew who gave them that authority they pretend to. Their independent state of nature will not do; that has been baffled till it is made ridiculous. And mankind was always under government from the first man that was born; and government was then instituted by God, as I have fully shewed. So that it was no invention of the people; for it was in being before ever there was a man born in the world. And from the first institution of it in Adam, it has descended without interruption to this day: for though it has changed hands by conquests, usurpations, and rebellions, yet it never ceased; but whoever took it from another, kept it himself, and never suffered it to come to the free and equal vote of the people. They are still kept under, whoever gets the government; but their name is made use of to catch fools.

3. C. The *Observer* you were upon of the 19th last month, N. 36. says, *The original contract or coronation oath ——— obliges the prince to confirm such laws as*  
*th,*

*the commons choose.* And that you may be sure he means only the commons, he gives it in *Latin*, such *laws* (says he) *quas vulgus elegerit*, as it is in the *Latin oath*. And in the *French* of *Ed. 2.* and *3.* it is, *Les quels la commune aur' esue*. And in the *English* of *Hen. VIII.* and other times it is, *which the commons of the realm shall choose.* So that here (says he) it is plain, the king or queen derive their authority of confirming the laws, or giving the royal assent to them, from our constitution; and with this qualification, that they must be such as the commons or community choose.

R. Here the lords are left quite out from being any part of our constitution, and the king (or queen) made but a cypher in it; for if he must confirm those laws the commons choose, he is but an officer that puts the seals to it, and the whole power is with the commons, and the royal assent is but a ceremony; which if the king will not do, they may compel him, or do it without him, as they have done before now. And this is fine doctrine to be trump up now again!

As to his argument from the coronation-oath, I have answered it in the former volumes, N. 126. and 143. It is no original contract; for the king is king before it, and as much before as after. Even king William was not crowned for some time after he was made king; yet he was king to all intents and purposes as much before as after. Coronation and coronation-oaths were not from the beginning, nor are they essential to government. The king gives us there the security of his oath, and if he breaks it, he is guilty before God of the breach of an oath; but this gives no coercion to his subjects over him.

4. C. The *Observer* lays stress upon the form of our acts of parliament, *Be it enacted by the king, with the advice of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, &c. and by authority of the same.* Whence he infers, that they have a share in the legislature, and bids you answer it if you can.

R. I think the *form* makes for me against him; for the *enacting* part is attributed only to the king: *Be it enacted by the king* — Then follows, *with the advice of, &c.* To *advise* or *consent* is one thing, but to *enact* is another, and by *authority of the same*; that is, by the *same authority* before mentioned, of the king who *enacts*, and the lords and commons, who *advise* or *consent*.

But I will grant there is an *authority* (though not over the king) in the lords and commons; for it is not every one that has the *privilege* or *authority*, if you please to call it so, to *advise* the king in making of *laws*, or whose *consent* he thinks necessary to it. But then this *privilege* or *authority* is *derived* wholly and solely from the crown. If they held it *independently* of the crown, they would be *co-ordinate* powers, which our law abhors, and is a *contradiction* in all government.

5. We may observe likewise, that this *form* of *acts* of parliament is but of later days. the former *stile* was, *Be it enacted by the king, with the advice of the lords, the commons humbly praying.* The commons did then *petition* for their laws. *Forms* may alter, but our *constitution* is the same.

6. C. It is of great use, *master*, to correct these *vulgar errors* that run among the people; for by this they mistake our *constitution*, and are disposed for *rebellion*. See an example of it here, from that common saying, that the king has only a *negative voice* in the making of *laws* (which you have confuted already) the *Observer* now improves upon it, and would take even *that* from the crown, and makes the king (or queen) *obliged* to *confirm* such laws as the commons choose, and then he is a king of clouts indeed! These men from scraps of sayings they pick out of their *modus's*, and other little books not worth a groat, would persuade us against our *constitution*, what it was, and what we see it before our eyes at this day; for when both *houses* of parliament have prepared a *bill*, they present it to the king to be passed into a law, and he either *enacts* it, or *rejects* it, as he thinks fit. But he does not present a *bill* to them,

to be passed by them into a *law*. So that they have no occasion for a *negative*; for he never asks them the *question*. But when he *rejects* a *bill*, this is a *negative* upon them; and the *affirmative* is wholly with him to say, *I will this to be a law*; and this makes it a *law*. The *parliament* prepares, he gives the *sanction*; but our *demagogues* would take all from the *crown* —

---

Saturday, July 10, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 339.

---

1. Of the act of *indemnity* and *oblivion* upon the *restoration* of king *Charles II.* Of what use to the *presbyterians*.
2. The first step to *reformation* is in our *thoughts* and *principles*.
3. The present *Observer* set to answer the former, as to the *murder* of the *king*.
4. I have no *malice* to the *presbyterians*. The best way is to let them alone; to *forgive*, but not to *trust* them.
5. The *Observer* charges me, from Sir *John Dingley's* papers, of reflecting upon the princess *Sophia*.
6. And applies the calumny to the *prince* and *princess* of *Orange*, and the late *revolution*.
7. He is for and against *revolution-principles*; for they cut both ways.

1. Conn. **T**HE *Observer* is not pleased with you, *master*, for producing the papers of Sir *John Dingley*. He says it was only to abuse the poor *presbyterians*; but that the act of *indemnity* clears them from all that.

R. From what? from the *punishment* due to their *rebellion*? But, *countryman*, this confirms their *guilt*; else what needed they an act of *indemnity*? A pardon supposes a *crime*.

G 2

C. But

R. I think the *form* makes for me against him; for the *enacting* part is attributed only to the *king*: *Be it enacted by the king* — Then follows, *with the advice of, &c.* To *advise* or *consent* is one thing, but to *enact* is another, and by *authority of the same*; that is, by the *same authority* before mentioned, of the *king* who *enacts*, and the *lords* and *commons*, who *advise* or *consent*.

But I will grant there is an *authority* (though not over the *king*) in the *lords* and *commons*; for it is not every one that has the *privilege* or *authority*, if you please to call it so, to *advise* the *king* in making of *laws*, or whose *consent* he thinks necessary to it. But then this *privilege* or *authority* is *derived* wholly and solely from the *crown*. If they held it *independently* of the *crown*, they would be *co-ordinate* powers, which our *law* abhors, and is a *contradiction* in all *government*.

5. We may observe likewise, that this *form* of *acts* of *parliament* is but of later days. the former *stile* was, *Be it enacted by the king, with the advice of the lords, the commons humbly praying.* The *commons* did then *petition* for their *laws*. *Forms* may alter, but our *constitution* is the same.

6. C. It is of great use, *master*, to correct these *vulgar errors* that run among the *people*; for by this they mistake our *constitution*, and are disposed for *rebellion*. See an example of it here, from that common saying, that the *king* has only a *negative voice* in the making of *laws* (which you have confuted already) the *Observer* now improves upon it, and would take even *that* from the *crown*, and makes the *king* (or *queen*) *obliged* to *confirm* such *laws* as the *commons* choose, and then he is a *king of clouts* indeed! These men from *scraps* of *sayings* they pick out of their *modus's*, and other little books not worth a groat, would persuade us against our *constitution*, what it was, and what we see it before our eyes at this day; for when both *houses* of *parliament* have prepared a *bill*, they present it to the *king* to be passed into a *law*, and he either *enacts* it, or *rejects* it, as he thinks fit. But he does not present a *bill* to them,

to be passed by them into a *law*. So that they have no occasion for a *negative*; for he never asks them the *question*. But when he *rejects* a *bill*, this is a *negative* upon them; and the *affirmative* is wholly with him to say, *I will this to be a law*; and this makes it a *law*. The *parliament* prepares, he gives the *sanction*; but our *demagogues* would take all from the *crown* —

---

Saturday, July 10, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 339.

---

1. Of the act of *indemnity* and *oblivion* upon the *restoration* of king *Charles II*. Of what use to the *presbyterians*.
2. The first step to *reformation* is in our *thoughts* and *principles*.
3. The present *Observer* set to answer the former, as to the *murder* of the *king*.
4. I have no *malice* to the *presbyterians*. The best way is to let them alone; to *forgive*, but not to *trust* them.
5. The *Observer* charges me, from Sir *John Dingley's* papers, of reflecting upon the princess *Sophia*.
6. And applies the calumny to the *prince* and *princess* of *Orange*, and the late *revolution*.
7. He is for and against *revolution-principles*; for they cut both ways.

1. Conn. **T**HE *Observer* is not pleased with you, *master*, for producing the papers of Sir *John Dingley*. He says it was only to abuse the poor *presbyterians*; but that the act of *indemnity* clears them from all that.

R. From what? from the *punishment* due to their *rebellion*? But, *countryman*, this confirms their *guilt*; else what needed they an act of *indemnity*? A pardon supposes a *crime*.

G 2

G. But

C. But he calls it an act of *oblivion*, (in the *Observer* of the 30th last month, N. 39.) which passed in the reign of king *Charles II.*

R. And what was it we were to forget? Was it their good deeds, or their *wicked* ones? And I wish they were *forgot*, so they would do them no more. But have they done nothing since that time which calls their old  *sins* to remembrance? Men cannot *forget*, while they continue the same *practices*. Has the *Observer* forgot *Pentland hills*, and *Bothwell bridge* in *Scotland*—*Praise*—*God*—*Barebone's plot*, the *Rye-house*, and many more in *England*, not to name others of later date? Let him look the *Wolf stript*, Sect. v. p. 21. of the *first edition*, and he will see some more instances after that act of *oblivion*.

2. C. He says, that several *presbyterian ministers* in and about *London* were against cutting off the king's head, when they saw it come to that.

R. No doubt men may *start* at their own *wickedness*, when they see the dismal *effects* of it. And all men do not see these *effects* at first: *Is thy servant a dog, that I should do these things*, said *Hazael*? Men are drawn into *wickedness* by *degrees*: First, we give way to evil *thoughts* of the king, and lose all reverence to his *authority*: Then we delight to *blacken* him, and give wrong *turns* to all his *actions*: Then we *cabal*: And at last take *arms*, under the specious *pretence* of *liberty* and *property*, ay, and of *religion* too, which forbids it. And then we must *destroy* him for our own *security*! Therefore *Solomon* began at the root, and bade us beware of *curfing the king in our thoughts*. And for this reason I have endeavoured to disprove the principles of *rebellion*; for our *actions* flow from thence.

But as to the part the *presbyterians* had in the murder of king *Charles I.* or the *restoration* of king *Charles II.* of which the *Observer* boasts, I refer him to that book which his predecessor *Observer* took to task, called *Cassandra*, where in the *first part*, sect. xiv. and xv. these two points are particularly considered; and are

not at all answered, either by this or the former *Observer*.

3. But what will he say to *Tutchin-Observer* which he continues? who justifies the *decollation* (as he in *scorn* calls it) of king *Charles I.* and ridicules its being a *martyrdom*; which he will find in my former *Volumes*, see *Charles* in the *Index*. And can the act of *oblivion* take place, while these *horrid* things are every day repeated, and the *wounds* of our *martyr'd* sovereign, and of *monarchy*, are thus ript up, and kept still fresh a *bleeding*!

4. But I have no *malice* to the *presbyterians*, though I cannot *forget* them. They will rub up our *memories*! I would only imitate the *piety* and the *prudence* of king *Charles I.* in his *dying* words to his *children*, which I have given you before; that is, *To forgive these men, but never to trust them; for that they had been most false to him who gave them power.*

But I love not to *rake* into dirt. I have only *referr'd* the *Observer* where he will find *answers* to his *vindications* of them; but I do not *repeat*. And the kindest thing he can do for them, is to say nothing of them, for the less of them the better — Therefore I leave him to pursue his other matters, wherein he performs to much more advantage.

5. C. But he has another charge upon you, *master*, and more terrible than this — In the same *Observer*, N. 39. he says of the publisher of these *papers* of Sir *John Dingley's*, That *her royal highness princess Sophia* is much obliged to him for *accusing* her mother of being *privy* to such a *plot* against her own father and brother, and not revealing it. He makes her a very *dutiful daughter* and *sister*.

R. This was straining a blow at me as much out of the way, as when they would make me an enemy to the *revolution*! For was it any reflection upon the *princess Sophia*, to set down an answer of her mother's, which was very *Christian*, and very *loyal*? Was that to say, or to suppose, that *princess Sophia* would not have done the same? That she would not have proved as *dutiful* a

daughter, and as just and kind a *sister*, had her case been the same? Or that the offer of a *crown*, from the hands of *rebels*, and contrary to the *laws* of the land, would have made her *swerve* in the least from her duty to *God*, to the *king* her *father*, or to the *king* her *brother*? Tho' *popery* was objected to them, and though it had been true?

And to charge the *queen* of *Bobemia*, that she did not reveal this *conspiracy* to her *father* and her *brother*, is, I suppose, speaking without book. Unless the *Observer* was let into the secret more than Sir *John Dingley*, and knew that she did not.

6. C. But he says, *Allowing the charge to be true, have you not given the presbyterians an unlucky opportunity to reply, that they remember the time, when the church of England made just application to the late king James's daughter, and his son in-law, to take arms against their father? &c.*

R. To take arms against their father — Did any body desire them to do that? And was Mr. *Observer* and the *presbyterians* in this *secret* too? How else should they make this *reply*? The *prince of Orange* declared against it; will they give him the lie too? But why do they not name those of the *church of England* who made this *application*? They have been often desired to do it; but it is such a *secret*, that they cannot find it out! Sir *John Dingley* names *Macdowell*, and *Layten*, and *Peters*, who were *presbyterian preachers*, and sent to solicit the *king* and *queen* of *Bobemia* to take arms against their *father*. Let the *Observer* name those *bishops* or *clergy*, or true sons of the *church of England*, who made the like *application* to the *prince* or *princess* of *Orange*. But these men will put the *revolution* upon the *deposing* point, upon the same foot with the 30th of *January*, and justify both upon the same *principles*. They will not take notice of the *abdication* upon which the *convention* went. They care not a farthing for a *revolution*, unless they can make a *rebellion* too! else it is no *revolution* for them!

7. C. This

7. C. This then is what they mean by *revolution-principles*, for they would hang any man of *revolution-principles*, where there was no *rebellion* in it, but *restoring of right*, as in the *revolution* which brought home king *Charles II.* *Monmouth* was of *revolution-principles*; and the *prince of Orange* was for another *revolution*, and they that were for the late *invasion* were of *revolution-principles*.

C. Then one *revolution* produces another. Is there no *gelt-revolution* that would *beget* no more; for they're *chargeable* things. It's a good thing, *master*, to know when one is well, for we often *change* for the *worse*!

---

Wednesday, July 14, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 340.

---

1. The *Scots* a *brave* and a *loyal* nation, always for *monarchy*.
2. They asserted the cause of king *Charles I.* to the last. But the *presbyterians* there opposed them, and *fold* the *king*.
3. The dispute betwixt the *presbyterians* and the *independents* which of them did *murder* the *king*.
4. By the *Review's* argument the *presbyterians* did *murder* the *king*.
5. The *Review* clears himself from being *mad*.
6. He runs a *muck*——and calls *Westminster-Hall* a *tene-ment* of *Satan*.
7. Why he is so angry at *Westminster-Hall*.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* you were last upon of the 30th last month, *Num. 39.* says, in vindication of the *presbyterians*, " Did not the *Scots* make their country a field of blood, and expose it to rain and devastation, by endeavouring to preserve king *Charles* the first, and by actually bringing over king *Charles* the second?"

R. What is this to the *presbyterians*? I grant the *Scots* to be a *brave* and a *loyal* nation; they were always for *monarchy*; and as few interruptions of the *royal-line* is to be seen in their history as in any *nation* of *Europe*. They never were a *commonwealth*, nor could *Oliver* himself force them to it, till by the help of the *Scotch covenanters* he had conquered the *loyal* party there. And the first step towards the *restoration* was concerted there with *Monk*——but not by the *presbyterians*.

2. It is very observable how the *genius* of that *nation* altered from the days of the *covenant*, as if it had drank *poison*; which yet could not extinguish the native *generosity* of that *people*, but it burned the stronger in those breasts which were proof against the *witchcraft* of *presbytery*. And they were then (as they are still) the greatest and most *noble* part of that *nation*. The *parliament* there raised a gallant *army* under the command of duke *Hamilton*, to rescue king *Charles I.* then in the hands of his murderers in *England*. This was commonly called *The Duke's engagement*; but the *general assembly* protested against it, as an *unlawful engagement*, and contrary to the *covenant*; and their *bell-weathers* of *preachers* laid out their *lungs* all over the *nation* to dissuade the *people* from it, as being an *engagement* against *God* and his *cause*! And when that *army* was unhappily defeated in *England*, the *kirk* in *Scotland* put all those under *censure* who were concerned in it, and forced them to stand on the *stool* of *repentance*, and confess the *unlawfulness* of that *engagement*, even after the murder of the *king*, to shew how heartily they were *sorry* for it! And who would not submit to this *discipline* were *barassed* and *ruined*, they and their *families*. And to shew their *sincerity*, they wrote letters to the *king* then in *restraint*; professing their utmost detestation of his being under *confinement*, or any *violence* to be offered to his *sacred person*; and how *joyful* they would be to see his *majesty* restored to his *honour* and *freedom*: and at the same time sent their *protestations* to the *parliament* in *England* against the *king's* being admitted with *honour* to any of his *houses*  
in

in or near *London* (as they had stipulated, in *mockery* when they *sold* him) till he had first given sufficient *security* for the establishment of the *covenant* and the extirpation of *episcopacy*. You will see the *dates* of these *letters* in the *xiv. Sect.* of the first part of *Cassandra*, with a larger account of these things. And I think I was obliged to say thus much of it here, that the *selling* the king (little to their honour who *bought* him) and the base *treachery* of the *presbyterians* towards him might not lie upon the *nation*, but at their door only who were guilty of it. And now they would (*modestly*!) shelter themselves under the *loyalty* of that *nation* which they have *disgraced*. If the *nation* could have been justified without exposing the *presbyterians*, I had said nothing of it; but *Scotland* has suffered too much *by* them, to suffer *for* them too.

3. C. 'Tis a pleasant dispute betwixt the *presbyterians* and *independents* which of them *killed* the king? The *independents* say they only cut off his *head*—not of a king, but of a private man who had no marks of *royalty* about him, no *guards*, no *revenues*, no *power*. And the *presbyterians* had taught them to distinguish betwixt the king's *authority* and his *person*; therefore that the *authority* being gone, the *person* was no more than of another man. And the *presbyterians* cannot deny but that they *slew* his *authority*, and consequently (say the *independents*) they *slew* the king. It was they who first took *arms* against him, and carried on their *rebellion* till they had despoiled him of all his *power*, and put him in *prison*. Then the *independents* came in only as the *executioners*, as said an old *ballad*, to the tune of *forty-eight*.

Soon their unhallowed fingers stript  
Their sov'reign liege of pow'r and land,  
And having smote their master, slip't  
The sword into their fellows hand:  
But he that wears his eyes may note,  
That oft a butcher binds a goat,  
And leaves his boy to cut her throat.

}

Why should the *presbyterians* be angry at their apt scholars, the *independents*, *anabaptists*, &c. who learned their *doctrine*, and followed their *example*? as says my *ballad* again,

For what's th' *enthusiastick* breed,  
Or men of *knipperdolling's* creed,  
But *cov'nanters* run up to *seed*?

}

4. R. Why may not I say that the *presbyterians* killed king *Charles I.* as well as the *Review* says that I killed king *James II.* because he supposes I was at the *Boyn*? And he argues that every *bullet* shot there did kill the *king*, being so designed, (see Num. 291.) which I will allow him; for *imagining* the *king's* death is *treason*, much more *shooting* at him. And this is what I have been labouring all along, to convince men that the *thought* of *resistance* is *rebellion*; as he who *hateth* his *brother* is a *murderer*. And the *principle* of *power* in the *people* does *depose* and *murder* all the *kings* and *governments* in the *world*! and therefore the *Observer* can never clear the *presbyterians* from the *murder* of the *king*, unless he can clear them from having *resisted* him, and taken *arms* against him. It was this *principle* of *resistance* which cut off his head more than the *ax*! and it is in vain to dispute who gave the *blow*. The matter is who *dethroned* him, *stript* him of his *power*. and brought him to the *block*! These——These——were his *murderers*!

5. C. But now you have quoted the *Review*, and allowed his *argument*, that you had *killed* the *king* if you had been in *arms* against him at the *Boyn*; I desire your *animadversions* upon his late performances, for they seem to be *extraordinary*.

R. He has got a *mad man* to talk with, and to keep pace with him, for none else could do it; and he vindicates himself from being *mad*. This *Julian Johnson* did in the last book he wrote, which confirmed all *sober men* in the opinion they had of him before.

6. The

6. The *Review* is now running a *muck*—he is resolved to *kill* every man he meets, till some or other knock him o'th' head. This seems his full resolution, and to die no other *death*! he falls most outrageously upon *Westminster-Hall*, upon the *army*, and upon the *parliament*; he will not leave one *rag* of the *government* but what he *tears* to *pieces*! In his of the 22d. last month, *Num. 37.* he calls *Westminster-Hall* an old tenement of *Satan's*; for thus he tells his story, *Walking along your streets, not long ago, near an old tenement of Satan's called Westminster-Hall*—

7. C. He *smarted* there once, and was ordered to the *pillory*, and has been an enemy to *justice* ever since! he arraigns not any one *judge* alone, but puts them all together into a *bag*, which he makes the *tenement* of *Satan*!

---

Saturday. July 17, 1708. N<sup>o</sup>. 341.

---

1. The *liberty* the *Review* takes with *Westminster-Hall* is a dissolution of all *government*.
2. He gives up our *army* as a *donation* to the *devil*.
3. He makes this *parliament* a *house* of *devils*, and *Satan* their *speaker*.
4. All this the natural result of *power* in the *people*.
5. Reason to make this a *test*. He proclaims *violence* to be used against the *parliament*.
6. How he *barangues* the *people* upon it.
7. By a *tory* he means a *church-parliament*, who will not abolish *episcopacy* in *England*. He sends them all to the *devil*, and prompts the *people* to take *arms* against them.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Review* is against the *law*, because the *law* is against him. And can *justice* be administered, while the *courts* of *justice* are suffered to be thus *insulted*, and called the *tenement* of *Satan* by every mean and angry fellow? This is the *liberty* of the *subject* he is pleading for, the *privilege* of *free-born Englishmen*! and this *liberty* is what you, *master*, have been

proving to be perfect *slavery*, to be a dissolution of all *laws* and *government*, while no reverence is paid to those by whom the *laws* are administered, but every body takes upon him to *censure* his *judges*, and to be *judge* over them. This it is to make the *people* the *last resort*, and *judges* superior to *kings* and *parliaments*! who now fees not this to be utter *confusion*?

2. R. I will next shew you how he treats our *armies* that *fight* our *battles*, and what thanks he gives them for all their *blood* and *labour*. In the *Review* of the 26th last month, *Num.* 39. "We'll go (says he) to the very gates of *Satan's* kingdom, the very army, that sink of blasphemy and curses, where heaven is insolently defied every hour—Even these wretches disciplined for the devil, and as it were left by the rest of the world as a donation to the devil, that know him not from their *Maker*, and know little of their *Maker*, other than to swear by his name, that have the very perfection of wickedness among them—and think it their glory to fear nothing, no not the God that made them, &c."

C. Enough, enough, *master*, pray let's have no more of it—And shall those gallant *soldiers* who conquer our *enemies* abroad, be thus *insulted* and trod upon by every little *warlet* at home! It would make one *start* when he sees a *soldier* and cry—There's one of *Satan's* kingdom! a *donation* for the *devil*! keep out of his way—

R. And he had best keep out of their way, if they are such *devils* as he makes them! his best excuse is, that he is run *mad*—that may save his bones. He wrote this in *Midsummer-moon*.

3. C. And in the same *moon*, in his *Review* of the 16th last month, *Num.* 35. he falls yet more severely upon the *parliament*, and says,

"If it were possible for a *house* of *parliament* to be metamorphosed, and all the *members* to be turned into real *devils*, true, literal, numerical *infernals*, with *Satan* himself to be their *speaker*, could it be a Christian's duty to acquiesce with them as *legislators*—No,  
"no,

" no, gentlemen, names make no distinction of things,  
 " a house of *tories* is a house of *devils*, in a too just  
 " sense, and *tyranny* is *tyranny* in any shape, and is to  
 " be *resisted* in any shape. I say no more till this cause  
 " comes nearer in view, &c.

R. He speaks of the meeting of the present *parliament*; and being afraid they will be *tories*, he has thus dressed them up beforehand!

C. If it were not for this *Satan* he could do nothing  
 — *Westminster-Hall* is the *tenement* of *Satan*; the  
*army* is the very gates of *Satan's* kingdom; and the *parliament*  
 are all *devils*, and *Satan* their *speaker*! he plays  
*Satan* at them all. *Satan* stands him in good stead, and  
 is never from his elbow.

4. R. If he be not yet stark *mad*, I would reason with  
 him a little upon his *scheme* of government. Here he  
 makes himself *judge* whether the *parliament* be *tories* or  
 not; and if he so thinks, then he makes them all *devils*,  
 and as such to be *resisted*. And has not every man the  
 same *liberty* as Mr. De Foe? And some may think  
*whigs* to be as great *devils* as he thinks *tories*; and then  
 let the *parliament* be what it will, they must be *devils* on  
 one side or other. And all this is the natural result of  
 placing the *original* of power in the *people*. Has it not  
 been made *ridiculous* enough already? Is it not apparent  
 to any one that will open but half an *eye*, that from this  
 very instance brought by the great *assertor* of the power  
 of the *people*, no government whatever can subsist where  
 this *principle* is entertained. Nor can any be a good  
*subject* who does not *detest* and *abhor* it, and will not freely  
 and openly *renounce* it.

5. C. It would be a more reasonable *test* than many  
 have been imposed; and if the denial of it were made  
*high-treason*, it could be better justified than some things  
 that have been so made, which are of far less conse-  
 quence; for this strikes at all sorts of governments, as  
 well *commonwealth* as *monarchy*. No constitution what-  
 soever can stand before this *principle*; for says the same  
*Review*, N. 35. p. 139. supposing this *parliament* to  
 be

be *tory* or *high-flying* (of which by the way he is judge) then says he,

“ Nothing but *violence* to oppose oppression can save us, and that I am sure is as lawful to a house full of tyrants as against one tyrant, for it shall ever remain a maxim with me, that tyranny is to be resisted, let it come in what shape, be sheltered under what pretence, or be backed with what authority soever.

R. And which does he think best, one tyrant, or a house full of tyrants? he's veering about to *monarchy*!

6. C. But having laid down this *principle of violence* to oppose oppression in the *parliament*, see how he lays out his *rhétorick* to spirit up the mob against them.

“ If ever we have (*says he*) a *tory*, *high-flying* parliament, this nation will be betrayed and sold by them to tyranny and *French* government, our liberties will be invaded, our sovereign insulted, our laws be abused, our *treasury* be exhausted, honest men will be crushed, knaves be advanced, and, in short, the nation will be undone.

7. R. We know whom he means by *knaves* and *honest* men; and he has fully told us what the *tory* and *high-church* is he speaks of, even *episcopacy* and the *hierarchy* of the church of England, which he calls *unscriptural*, and that it ought to be taken out of the way, and Great Britain to become one *presbyterian* church. And that if all other things were granted, our whole *liturgy*, *habits*, *ceremonies*, &c. were given up, yet he promises, in the name of all the *presbyterians*, not only of Scotland, but of England too, upon his own particular knowledge. that they will never be quiet, nor rest satisfied, while one rag of *episcopacy* remains in England. All which, and much more, I have shewed out of his book printed last year, called, *The Dissenters Vindicated; Or, A short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*. I began with it in Num. 226. and prosecuted it in several *Rehearsals* following; to which he has not thought fit to reply, otherwise than by saying that he will justify every thing

in that book—for he never *retracts*! and by what he says now, if the *parliament* should do any thing in favour of the *church of England*, or if he thinks they are so inclined, then they are *devils*, and he has proclaimed *violence* to be used against them.

---

Wednesday, July 21, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 342.

---

1. Whether the *Review* or I is most against *parliaments*.
2. What has provoked the *Review* to this *passion* against the present *parliament*.
3. His *supposition* overthrows the *revolution*, and unhinges the present *government*.
4. He would be *king* himself, and sets himself up above the *people*, as well as above *kings* and *parliaments*.
5. His *flower of rhetoric* upon those who take the *oaths* in *hypocrisy*, as a new *monster*.
6. Former *examples* shewed him—and later.

1. Coun. **W**HAT was it could provoke the *Review* to attack the *parliament* in that violent manner as you shewed in your last? for he flew upon them, as the saying is, without *fear* or *wit*. If you had said the half of that I know what would have become of you—yet they accuse you of not being a friend to *parliaments*, because you would keep the *prerogatives* above them; and, sure, I think that more reasonable than to set *De Foe* above them, and every such as he in *England*, to make *devils* of them, and cry to *arms* against them!

R. I am not against *parliaments*, I think them an excellent *constitution*. But as the *corruption* of the best things is the worst, so when some would raise the *parliament* above the *crown*, and give them a *coercion* over it, the consequences are dreadful, and is an utter dissolution of our *constitution*. They are the king's *great council*, as they are called in *law*, and as they were in their original *constitution*. But when, instead of *counsellors*, they would set up (as in *forty-one*) to be co-ordinate

nate powers, and at last *superior* to the *king*, and to sit as *judges* upon him; then—then—it is that I oppose them. And I have all the *law* in *England* on my side; and they can never derive a power from the *people* to make them *superior* to the *king*, which will not make every *De Foe* and *Tutchin* and every man in the nation *superior* to them, for the *original* power must always be *superior* to the *derived*. And they may see it now in this attempt of *De Foe* upon them, and though his power be but small, yet it may influence others. And we have seen nations enflamed from such beginnings. There is such a thing as a *people* being *poisoned* with ill *principles*, by a multitude of *papers* and *pamphlets*; and never was any nation so ply'd with them as ours has been of late years. And I have ventured in the gap against a great multitude, and hope I have lost no ground.

2. But now, *countryman*, as to your question what has provoked the *Review* at this time? I'll tell you the case. There are some who have lately *qualified* themselves, and are chosen in this *parliament*. This frightens the *Review* and his friends out of their wits; they fancy there is a *snake* in the *grass*, and that these have not thrown off their old *principles*, though they have taken the new *oaths*. And all the former part of this *Review* we have been upon, *Num.* 35. is spent upon these, whom he calls *abjuration taking Jacobites*; and indeed he paints them out in such a manner as I believe you never read the like, he will let them be neither *Christians* nor *infidels*, *papists* nor *protestants*, *Britains* nor *foreigners*, *high-church* nor *low*; yet all of these together, and none of them! he makes such *monsters* of them as never were seen at *Bartholomew-Fair*! and then supposing such to corrupt the *parliament*, he ends with making them a *house of devils*, and *Satan* their *speaker*! and calls to *arms* against them, as you have heard.

3. C. But is it not *uncharitable* to suppose that a man takes an *oath* against his own *mind*? we ought rather to think he has changed his *mind*, when he *swears* contrary to what

what he *professed* before ; otherwise what shall we say to them who took the *oaths* to the late king *James* and his *heirs*, and yet presently after took all the *revolution-oaths*? To suppose they acted *hypocritically*, and contrary to their own *persuasion*, would be to dissolve the *government*, and take away all *security* in *oaths*. But when a man has *qualified* himself according to all that the *law* requires, for Mr. *De Foe* to put his finger upon this or that man, or any party of men, and say they act not *sincerely*, and *point* them out to the *nation* to be *mobb'd* and *tore* in *pieces*, I say this is to undermine the *government*, and to suppose that they are *sure* of no body. It is taking the whole *government* upon himself, that none shall be *trusted* or *employ'd* but whom he thinks fit ! and if any others be admitted into the *parliament*, he will *metamorphose* them into a *house of devils*, and declare war against them, and spirit up the *mob* to *destroy* them !

4. *R.* And here he takes upon him to oppose his own original of power the *people*, for none are admitted to the *house of commons* but who are *chose* by the *people*. But no matter for that—the *people* may be *filly*, may be *imposed* upon, may be *bribed* and *cheated*; therefore Mr. *De Foe* will correct their *choice*, and raise them up in arms against their own *choice* ! And this truly shews what these *orators* for the power of the *people* mean by the *people*, every man means *himself*, and no more ! he would be *judge* of the *people*, as well as of *kings* and *parliaments* ! that is, in short, every man would be *king* ! and that is all the sense of these *declamations* for the *people*, for *liberty* and *property*, and all the *cant* of *rebellion* to *cheat* and *gull* the *filly people* to their own *destruction*, to raise them up in arms against one another, to break through the *laws* and an *established constitution*, that they might be preferred by an *usurper* or a *rebel*, who must overturn both *laws* and *constitution* to gain the *power* to keep them *inviolable* !

5. *C.* This *Review* says of these men whom he supposes take the *oaths* in *deceit*.

“ 'Tis

“ 'Tis no breach of my charity to say, these are a sort  
 “ of men that the world never saw before; language it  
 “ self never formed a word significant or expressive of  
 “ their character; human invention never found an  
 “ image to represent them, or human imagination an  
 “ idea to conceive them by.

6. *R.* If that were true, Mr. *De Foe* had not been half so angry; but he has a right *idea* of those times wherein his sort of *saints* screwed themselves into *power*, by the self same method of playing with *oaths*. And he's afraid their *devil* should be outdone! nothing *vexes* one like having the *tables* turned upon him, and to be served in his own kind!

For was there an *oath* the *godly* took,  
 But in due time and place they broke?  
 Didn't they, to the glory of the Lord,  
 Perjure themselves, and break their word?  
 For having first broke both  
 Th' *allegiance* and *supremacy* oath,  
 Did not they force the nation  
 To take and break the *protestation*?  
 To *swear* and after to *recant*  
 The *solemn league* and *covenant*?  
 Didn't they *swear* in exprefs words  
 To prop and back the house of *lords*,  
 And after turn'd out the whole house full  
 Of *peers*, as dangerous and unuseful?

With many other instances the *poet* gives, and they  
 had *casuistry* then too, and could solve all this, for

He that *imposes* an *oath* makes it,  
 Not he that for's convenience takes it:  
 Then how can any man be said  
 To break an *oath* he never made?

But to come nearer our times, and to shew that these  
*saints* are the same *saints* still in their successors,

This

This the constant rule and practice  
Of all their late apostles acts is.

For didn't they *swear* to the late king *James*, and *vow* eternal *loyalty* to him in their *addresses*, and took *God* to witness! when at the very same time they were *betraying* him, and now *boast* of it!

And what is their playing with the *sacramental test*, which is as *sacred* as an *oath*? and yet they *complain* of it, which shews they do it not *willingly*—only *occasionally*—and may not others say the same? So that we see,

In the *wicked* there's no vice  
Of which the *saints* have not a spice.

---

Saturday, July 24, 1708.

Nº 343.

---

1. A Rowland for your *Oliver*, as to *perjury*.
2. A word the *Review* wanted to express all *wickedness*.
3. The *solemn league and covenant* transcribed from the *holy league* in *France*.
4. The *Review's* description of a *covenanter*.
5. Rightly *apply'd*.
6. The *covenanters* transferred their *allegiance* to the *French king*.
7. The *picture* of a *covenanter* in *miniature* drawn by the *Review*.
8. What a *covenanted-parliament* did.
9. The *Review* would fain see the like again.

1: Coun. **Y**OU have given the *Review* a Rowland for his *Oliver*—You have shewed him the perfection of *perjury* in those who now object it to others! their's is the *original*, ours but an ill drawn *copy*. There are some so *squeamish* as strain at a *gnat* of an *oath*, but can this be objected by those who swallow *camels*? You have given them instances of their *perjuries*, not one, two,

two, or three, but quite through, from beginning to ending ———

Which shews plainly what they thought,  
That oaths and swearing go for nought;  
Further I mean than carrying on  
Some self-interest of their own.

2. R. The *Review* wants a word to express perjury by. He says (as quoted in my last) *That the world never knew before, language it self never formed a word significant or expressive of their character* ——— who take unlawful oaths. But I'll give him a word to oblige him, which language has form'd, and which the world has known before, and which is fully significant and expressive of these sort of men he means, and of any other the most wicked he can imagine ——— It is but one word, and it is a dear word, a word he loves intirely, and has wrote in defence of it ——— It is a solemn word, and a stout word, that has slain (and 'tis to be feared has damn'd) many thousands for every letter in it ———

C. Then I hope it is a short word, I'm sure 'tis a terrible one. Pray, master, let's have it.

R. In one word it is the *covenant*! ——— which swore to preserve and defend the king's majesty's person and authority, yet cut him out of all authority, and at last cut off his head! and was framed for that very purpose.

3. It is word for word the *holy league* in France, changing names only, and was sent into Scotland by cardinal Richlieu, who was the constant correspondent and aider of these covenanters he had made; and their recourse was to him, whom they solicited for a French power to invade the kingdom (for the preservation of the protestant religion against king Charles I.) and wrote a letter to the French king to put themselves under his protection, which *Rushworth* has given us *verbatim*. I quote an *historian* they will not question.

4. Now, Mr. De Foe, let me borrow a little of your rhetoric in the same *Review*, N. 35. to describe a covenant,

*nanter*, for I cannot do it half so well. Thus then, as you say,

“ ’Tis no difficulty to him to take oaths against what  
 “ he really purposes to do; to abjure the cause he from  
 “ his heart espouses, and the person he reserves his alle-  
 “ giance for; no parliament can make an oath he will  
 “ not take, and should you ask him to abjure God or  
 “ the devil, the matter is equal; for if he abjures the  
 “ last, he is never the farther off from his service, and  
 “ if he does not abjure the first, he is never the nearer  
 “ to regard him. Under this jury are couched and con-  
 “ cealed innumerable mischiefs, such as these; he be-  
 “ comes protected by the very government he abhors;  
 “ he eats the bread of the nation he betrays, obtains the  
 “ favour of the prince he conspires to depose, he is che-  
 “ rished by the poor well—meaning creatures that he  
 “ debauches, he is embraced by that church he in his  
 “ heart disowns, and he is ignorantly received by those  
 “ that in their hearts abhor his designs.

5. C. All this agrees to a *tee* with the *covenanters*. Sure they *sat* for this *picture* which *De Foe* has drawn of them, for it is to the *life*! they reserved their *allegiance* for the *French king*, according to their bargain with cardinal *Richlieu*, yet *favore* it to king *Charles I.* and obtained his *favour*, while they were *conspiring* to *depose* him. They were *protected* by the very *government* they abhorred, they were *cherished* by the *church* they *disowned*, they eat the bread of the nation they *betrayed*, and were *entertained* by the silly creatures they *debauch’d*, and who in their hearts abhorred their *designs*.

6. R. These were the *loyal* men, who invited over a foreign *prince* against their own natural *sovereign*! while they were swearing *fidelity* to him, and calling *God* to witness the *sincerity* of their *hearts*! Their *letters* to the *French king* were taken with a *covenanting lord* in *London*, who was sent to the *Tower* for it, and, instead of the reward due to this *highest* of *treason*, the *king*, after his usual *clemency*, not only *pardoned* and *released* him, but, to charm these people with his *goodness*, he

preferred him to greater *honours*, and made him the chief *minister* in the kingdom, and put the other *covenanters* into full *power*. In return to which, and all other the unparalleled acts of his *mercy*, they took *arms* against him, and condemned him as a bloody *tyrant*!

7. C. What then makes the *Review* start at a little *perjury*, *treachery*, or *ingratitude*, as if he had never seen the like before! let him apply to a *covenanter* the remaining part of the *description* he gives in the same *Review*, N. 35. and his *wonder* will cease; for thus says he,

“ Let us come to his picture in miniature, like *Milton*’s description of *sin*, keeping the gates of *chaos* leading into the world. He is formed like a Christian, and has the face of a reasonable creature, but some cross lines in his countenance, which nature or art has no power to conceal, shew to a strict enquirer a mind distracted with a possession and complication of lunacies; his lower parts therefore are well described by cloven-feet, talons of vultures, snakes, serpents, devils, and all sorts of infernal monsters, which, twining about one another, form his intrails, through which all his digestures are voided, and being contaminated, and partaking of the nature of the vessels they pass through, the coagulated blood is of the same quality, stagnate vapours of treason, disaffection, &c. fume up into his head, infect his life, and he is a painted hypocrite without, but all viper and poison within.

8. R. He shot at a *pigeon* and hit a *crow*——We once saw a company of these *infernal dragoons*, who called themselves a *parliament*, and *Satan* their *speaker*, who filled these nations with *blood* and *confusion*, took upon them an *authority*, by virtue of the power of the *people*, to bring their *sovereign* to a *trial* before their mock *tribunal*, and condemn him to *death*, who overturned all the *laws*, and made *root and branch* work with the *church*, who minded their own business, and having seized the *revenues* of the *church* and the *crown*, and the *estates* of *delin-*

*delinquents*, because they did not make good use of them, therefore these *pious* men kept them all to themselves! they had *God* in their mouth, the *devil* in their heart, and the world in both their arms.

9. C. And it is a *parliament* of such *saints* as these that the *Review* would fain see again! This would be *parliamentum beatum*, as *Baxter* described *heaven*, for he would not let it be a *monarchy*! And while there are those in the *parliament* that have any regard to the *church*, or the *crown*, or to our *constitution*, Mr. *Review* makes them a *parliament* of *devils*, and to be resisted with violence.

---

Wednesday, August 4, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 344.

---

1. Gives some account of his *sick-bed* thoughts, particularly as to these *papers*. We see nothing but *condemnation* in ourselves.
2. Wherein then lies our *comfort* and *assurance*.
3. The *priesthood* of *Christ* is *delegated* to his *priests* upon *earth*, with power to offer the same *sacrifice* as he does in *heaven*.
4. The *church* conducts us to *heaven*, as well by the power of the *keys*, as by *preaching*.
5. The vile *contempt* of these things among us, even to *blasphemy*, of the most *hideous* sort that ever was heard!
6. The *satisfaction* I have had in *opposing* these things, and asserting the *monarchy* of *God* upon *earth*.
7. Who deny the *delegated priest*hood of *Christ*, deny his own *priest*hood. And will have him for their *king* to *punish* them, but not for their *priest* to *save* them.

Coun. I AM glad to see you again, *master*, you look like one rose out of the grave.

1. R. I have been very ill, *countryman*, and thought I was going to leave you for good and all. And, among other

other things, I had time to reflect upon your conversation and mine. I took no pleasure in the mixture of *levity* and *merriment* we have had, especially at the beginning, as I did not at the time; but I thought it was necessary to introduce what I had to say by way of instruction to the grossly deluded people of this nation, who would not otherwise have heard me, and keeping within the rules of *innocence* and *decency*, I had no grief of heart upon that account. The objection was only as to my own *reputation*, which appears very little, *countryman*, to one who is taking his last farewell of the world. But I thought nothing little that was intended for the service of God and his *truth*. It is *guilt*, *guilt* only, and wicked *intentions*, which then stick close to a man; for these go along with him to the other state, and he must give an account of them. But (alas!) what account can he give? his *repentance* is weak and unworthy, and fit to be repented of, and all our *righteousness* is as *filthy rags*. How then dare we appear in the presence of God! here is nothing before us but *condemnation*! there is nothing in our selves whence any *comfort* or *assurance* can arise! all is *darkness* and utter *despair*!

2. But then, as the *serpent* was lifted up in the wilderness, so we look by *faith* upon our great *high-priest* who was lifted up upon the *cross* for us, that whoever *believeth* in him should have *eternal life*; and though our *faith* be weak, yet the virtue is not in our *faith*, which is only the *hand* that reaches the *medicine* to us; the whole *virtue* is in the *medicine*, in the all full and sufficient *satisfaction* which *Christ* has made for us, in his own *person*, wholly without us, though applied inwardly by *faith*, which also is the gift of God.

3. And as *Christ* in his own *person* perpetually offers up the *sacrifice* of himself (once made) in the presence of his *Father* in *heaven*, to interpose betwixt the *wrath* of God and our *sins*; so has he ordained *priests* upon *earth*, to represent his *person*, and offer the same *sacrifice* in *resemblance* and *figure*, under the holy *symbols* he has commanded, which therefore he calls his own *body* and  
blood;

*blood*, granting us hereby to be made partakers of them; really and truly, in an outward and visible manner, and his *priests* to offer them up to *God* on *earth*, in conjunction with the same which he celebrates in his own *person* in *heaven*, making both one and the self same *sacrifice*, and uniting *heaven* and *earth* together, while all things here are done according to the *pattern* of things in *heaven*.

4. And both being thus made one *family*, and the *earth* the road to *heaven*, he has committed to his *vice-priests* on *earth* the *keys* of the kingdom of *heaven*, to *open* and to *shut*, to *remit* and *retain* sins, with promise to *ratify* their *sentence* (when justly passed) in *heaven*, to shew that our way thither is chalked out for us, and that we may not devise new means of our own invention in neglect of that *church* he has instituted for this end, and to conduct us as well by her *discipline* as her *doctrine*.

5. But we have burst the bonds, and cast away their *cords* from us—we have *ridiculed* all the glorious *economy* of our *salvation* under the contemptible name of *priest-craft*, which reflects principally upon our great *high-priest*. We have sent a messenger after him to tell him, *We will not have this man to reign over us*; we bid him come in *person* (as the *Jews* in mockery bade him come down from the *cross*, because they thought he could not) but in the mean time we despise the *delegation* he has made of his *priesthood* to men like our selves. We think we can be as good *priests* to our selves, or have none at all—we call the *sacrifice* he has appointed of himself upon *earth* a *grace-cup*, and that the *healb* may be begun by a *woman* a *gossip*, as well as by any *priest*! that the *people* may make *priests* and *sacraments* too to themselves if they think they want them; nay, that *God* himself has no *right* to govern them, unless they please to put it to the *vote*; and that he cannot exceed what *regulations* they please to put upon his *government*, which is derived from their superior *authority*! These are the utmost stretches of *blasphemy*! and such as I suppose no age before this ever knew; but with us

they are *rampant*, in *print* and in *vogue* every where! they are recommendations to men of *wit*! and *adornments* of *conversation*!

6. You and I have spent many a day, *countryman*, upon these subjects, and I assure you I do not repent it. I did bless God in my sickness who had given me opportunity to say so much against these growing and most pernicious *principles* of the age, more than I could have done any other way, and I thought my work was done when he pleased to call me. I did believe I was defending the *monarchy* of God on earth as well as in *heaven*, all the difference being, that the *government* of *heaven* is in the hands of *angels*, to whom God has *delegated* his *authority*, according to their several *orders*, in subjection to *Christ* whom he has made *head* over them all. And on earth he has *delegated* his *power* unto *men*, who govern the world under him, and by his *authority*; it is all the *monarchy* of God still, and who usurp it *without* or *against* his *authority* are guilty of *high-treason* against God, and invade his *prerogative*. These are they who place the *power* in the *people*, for God never gave it them; and it is the source of all the *confusions* in the world.

7. Again, who deny the *delegated priesthood* on earth, deny the *priesthood* of *Christ* in *heaven*; for who governs the *church* as God does the *world*, by *delegates* under him? And it is rejecting his *authority* absolutely to reject his *delegates*, because he governs no otherwise till he comes in *person*. But who will not have him for their *priest*, before that, and in his *delegates*, will then find him, to their sorrow, as their *king*, to execute *vengeance*; but none will have him as their *priest*, that is, their *saviour*, who have not *believed* in him as such. The *priest-craft* men, who make wide mouths in the *seat* of *scorners*, will not be able to stand in that *judgment*! when they shall see *heaven* and *earth* fly away from before the face of a *priest*! even that same *priest* against whom they have thrust out the *tongue*, and made him their *sport* all the day long! let them not trust to a death-bed repentance, we get no new *thoughts* there, but must feed upon the *stock* we laid in before.

At

---

Saturday, August 7, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 345.

---

1. Of the putting down *Bartholomew-Fair*.
2. The *Observer* gives this a turn to the prejudice of *St. Bartholomew's hospital*.
3. The reason of it, not charged upon all the *dissenters*, but their *managers*.
4. Why the *governors* of the *hospital* concerned themselves.
5. They proposed a *reformation* of the *abuses*. The *Observer* makes them *solicitors* for the *abominations*.
6. Yet he himself proposes the same they did.
7. A short *issue* to clear the *Observer*, or the *governors*.
8. The *bishop* is ridiculed for *punishing* some of the *enormities* of the *fair*, and called *Merry Andrew* his *ordinary*.
9. What *friends* these are to the *church*.

1. Coun. **N**OW you are come to us again, *master*, I hope you will be very well pleased with the *reformation* which has been begun in the *city*, in putting down *Bartholomew-Fair*, and will concur heartily with the *Observer* of the 30th last *June*, N. 39. who spends a great deal of rejoicing upon that occasion.

2. R. I shall be always glad, *countryman*, to hear of the *reformation* of *manners* or of *principles* any where. But as a *wasps* sucks *poison* out of the same *flower* whence a *bee* extracts *honey*, it is strange to see the temper of a sort of men who can give a turn to every thing suitable to their own inclinations, and to serve a *party*!

The *Observer* takes this occasion to attack and bespatter that noble foundation of *charity* of *St. Bartholomew's-Hospital*, and to discourage any from contributing further towards it.

G. That is strange indeed! I thought the *dissenters* were not against such *charities*, and many of them have contributed largely to several *charities*.

H 2

3. R.

3. R. I lay it not upon them ; but there is a *party* among them who are *managers*, and who act in their names, and mind only what they call the *interest* of their *party*, and to advance that, watch all opportunities to blacken and defame all who are well-affected to the *church* ; they turn every thing into *party*, and love not to see any *charity* thrive or well disposed of in the hands of *churchmen*. Now the *governors* of St. *Bartholomew's-Hospital* are *churchmen*, and the publick service of the *church* is in that *parish* regularly kept up, and duly attended, to the grief of heart of those who envy the honour and prosperity of the *church*. This has provoked the *Observer*, the present *agent* and publick *advocate* for the *dissenters*.

4. C. But I do not yet see how he can turn this matter of the *fair* against the *hospital*. They are two things, and of different natures.

R. I suppose some advantage did accrue to the *hospital* by the *fair* ; and the *governors* of the *hospital* we may suppose thought themselves obliged to take the best care they could of the revenue of the *hospital*, by all honest and lawful means.

C. But was that honest and lawful means to continue and encourage *debauchery* ? They should have proposed a *reformation* of these *abuses*, if they would have the *fair* kept up.

5. R. So they did, and pressed it most earnestly ; nor did they desire the continuance of the *fair* upon any other terms.

C. And does not the *Observer* mention this ?

R. No, not a word ; but on the contrary he lays open the *governors* as if they pleaded for *wickedness* and *debauchery* ; he says,

“ That some grave citizens, especially of those concerned in St. *Bartholomew's-Hospital*, are using all their endeavours to have that resolve (against the *fair*) altered, because of the profits accruing to the *hospital* by the *fair*——How can those concerned in the *hospital* plead for the continuance of these vile shews—

“ O

“ Or how can they expect that religious and charitably-  
 “ disposed persons should henceforth be their benefac-  
 “ tors, by leaving money, &c. to their hospital, when  
 “ they shall hear that any of the governors, or others  
 “ concerned in it, have been solicitors to have such abo-  
 “ minations continued ?

C. This is hard upon them indeed, to represent them  
 as *solicitors* for such *abominations* ! especially when they  
 were the men who proposed the *reformation* of all these  
*abominations* !

6. R. And it is harder in the *Observer*, because he  
 himself proposes a *reformation* of these *abuses*, and would  
 have some *manly exercises* set up instead of the *sheaves*, or  
*such other diversions* (says he) *might be contrived as may be*  
*inoffensive*. And in that case he says, *I believe no body*  
*will oppose it*, that is, the *fair* ; yet this was the very  
*proposal* of the *governors* of the *hospital*, who desired a  
*committee* might be appointed to consider of such *exer-*  
*cises* or *diversions* as might be *useful*, at least *inoffensive*.  
 But the *Observer* takes the honour of this *proposal* to  
 himself ; and turns upon the *governors* thus,

“ But to plead for a continuance of these riotous and  
 “ disorderly practices in booths and musick-houses, is  
 “ inconsistent with the gravity of a citizen, or the piety  
 “ of a Christian, so that I wonder how any man can have  
 “ the face to plead for the continuance of the fair dur-  
 “ ing a fortnight, without offering an expedient at the  
 “ same time to regulate the diversions, so as to prevent  
 “ people’s flying in the face of the laws of God, and  
 “ the nation,

7. C. If the *Observer* can name any of the *govern-*  
*ors* or others concerned in the *hospital*, who proposed a  
 continuance of the *fair* without such a *regulation*, he is  
 free to do it ; but if he can name none such, then he must  
 own this to be a most foul *slander*, which he has, without  
 any cause at all, thrown upon the *governors* of the *hospi-*  
*tal*, and through their sides to obstruct (as much as in  
 him lies) so pious and noble a *charity* ; and what reason

he had to do so let *himself* declare, or who prompted him to such an undertaking?

8. R. You may see how the *bias* runs, when, in the same *Observer*, telling how one *Healthy* the *Merry Andrew* was called to an account in the *bishop's* court for some *lewd pictures* he had exposed at *Bartholomew-Fair*, he words it thus respectfully towards the *church*,

"Such *lewd pictures*—(says he) as *Healthy*, the *Merry Andrew*, was censured lately for, by his *ordinary* at *Doctors Commons*.

C. He thought this a sheer piece of *awit*, and smart upon the *bishops*! to call the *bishop* the *ordinary* of *Merry Andrew*! this tickles the *party*, and runs among them—If the *bishops* do not censure *lewdness* when brought before them, then what fine *bishops* have we? Then they run upon the *bishops courts*, &c. and if they do censure it, then they are ridiculed, and the *bishop* is *ordinary* to *Merry Andrew*!

9. R. These are the men who call themselves the best friends of the *church*, and would have the *bishops* and *clergy* trust their *discipline* and all their concerns in their hands! they would take care of them!

C. And such as they *deserve* if ever they *trust* them; they see them making *mouthe* at them, and seeking all occasions against them; they cannot speak of *Bartholomew-Fair* or a *Merry Andrew*, but the *church* and her friends, and the *bishops* must be brought in as *acting* upon the same *stage*: some for *abetting*, and some for *correcting* these *abuses*—it is all one—they are all alike *exposed* and *ridiculed*! O rare friends of the *church*!

Wednesday, August 11, 1708. No. 346.

1. The *Observer* asserts a *coercive* power in the *parliament* over the *crown*.
2. He dares not come to the *laws* with me, but argues the same as *Bradshaw* at the *trial* of king *Charles I.*
3. If he can find a *law* for *coercion* he will be the *Magnus Apollo* of the *whigs*.
4. He has put it off *sine die*.
5. His *forty companions* of the *sovereignty*.
6. Or *forty competitors*.
7. He would have the king *obedient to suffer*; and that in case of *male-administration* he *forfeits his title*, and loses the very *name of king*.
8. He says *William the conqueror* did *ratify* this; and *swore* to it.
9. This an *unlucky instance*, and *forfeits all his credit*.

1. Coun. **Y**OU have let the *Observer* run on a great while proving the *coercive* power of *parliaments* over the *king*. Some think he has confused you, and that you have nothing more to say for your argument.

2. R. I let him go on, waiting for his *proof*; for all he has hitherto said is only *pickering*. His *proof* was to be from the *laws* of the *land*, that was what I desired and he undertook; but instead of that he brings quotations out of *Modus's* and *Mirror's*, and *Lamb's* *Saxon laws*, and other books wrote in times of *rebellion*, as of the *barons wars*, and in justification of them, which makes no more to me than if he had quoted serjeant *Bradshaw's* speech at the *trial* of king *Charles I.* in justification of the proceedings of that *rebel court* against their *king*. The *king* asked the same question at that *court* that I have done, that is, By what *law* of *England* they could *try* their *king*? And *Bradshaw* the *president* answered just as the *Observer* has done. He quoted *precedents* of *former*

mer rebellions, but summed up the whole in the *original power of the people*. If he could have found a *law of England* to justify coercion over the king, either by *parliament* or *people*, no doubt he would have produced it, for those *regicides* then took upon them the name of both *parliament* and *people*.

3. Now if the *Observer* can do what *Bradshaw* has not done, that is, shew us any *law of England* that justifies coercion over the crown, he will be the *Magnus Apollo* of all our *republican* party, and do more than all of them put together have ever been able to do. And without doing this, all he can say is but *trifling*, and exposing his *cause* the more. I have produced several *acts of parliament* condemning all coercion over the crown, and he has not given one for it: and I now tell him that he cannot, nor his *Jura Populi* to help him, yet he will still struggle in this baffled cause!

4. C. He seems to despair of it, for he has put it off *fine die*. In his of the 31 last month, *Num.* 48. he says to his countryman, "But we shall, God willing, take an opportunity, *Roger*, to prove that our constitution allowed a coercive power in parliaments over tyrants."

R. He will bring our *constitution* out of some mirror or other! but I caution him beforehand that I will accept nothing less than the known *laws* of the land. These are what I have produced on my side, and I expect to be paid in the same coin, else let him throw up the *cause*, and confess it will not bear, or we will take his *silence* for *consent*, for I suppose that will be all the answer I shall get.

5. But though the authorities he brings are not worth a farthing, yet I have some use to make of them, that is, to shew what he would be at. Thus in his of the 24 last month, *N.* 46. he quotes out of the *Mirror* how the Saxons conquered the Britains (war hawk!) *there being no less than forty of them who were companions of the sovereignty*. It was time then for them to be conquered! Here were co-ordinate powers, and what could come of it but war and destruction?

6. C.

6. C. I fancy, instead of *companions*, it should be *competitors* for the *sovereignty*.

R. And how would that mend the matter? Bless us! forty *competitors* for the *crown*! what *peace* could that *nation* have? But he goes on out of the *Mirror* of justices, "These princes, after great wars, tribulations, and troubles suffered for a long time, chose themselves one king to reign over them."

C. Did they come to it at last? They say bought wit is best; but it had been better for them and all the nation if they had submitted to whoever had the *right* at first, and saved all these *wars*, *tribulations*, and *troubles*. And I'll warrant there were *arrears* to be pay'd a long time after, before the nation got out of debt.

7. R. Well, but then he tells you how they cooked this *king* of their own making. He says they made him swear, *That he should be obedient to suffer right as well as his people*.

C. That is, *obedient* to be *hanged* as well as any other man——And then who shall be *judge*? even every *Observer* upon his *government*! O, the *Observer* would think it a pure thing to say, come up with my *king* and *hang* him there! This is what he would be at; and would not the *queen* reign *securely* under such *principles* as these?

R. But he goes on, and quotes *Lamb. Sax.* That by the *laws* of *St. Edward*, which he says were *ratified* by *William* the *conqueror*, and "sworn to by all our kings at their coronations, if the king do not govern according to the end for which he was constituted, he shall not so much as retain the name of a king, but forfeits his title."

8. C. This is to the point indeed! And did *William* the *conqueror* *ratify* this? Did he take this *oath*? Would a *conqueror* submit to this? Would the *Observer* put this upon us? Would he have been the man to have told the *conqueror*, that he had *forfeited* his *title*, and should not now retain so much as the *name* of a *king*? yet he tells it to *queen Anne*, and thinks himself

a good *subject*! This is the *rule* he sets down for our obedience to the present *government*, and to all other *governments*!

9. But, *master*, I have been told, that *William* the *conqueror* acted the *conqueror* in good earnest, that he divided our lands among his *Normans*, that he took away whole sides of countries from the *proprietors*, to make *forests* for himself, and that he pulled down no less than thirty *parish-churches* to make his *forest* in *Hampshire*; that he turned our *laws* into his *French*, which mark of *servitude* we retain to this day. Now this was the worst man in the world for the *Observer* to pitch upon for such a limited *monarch* as to submit his *title* to every *boor* in *England*, and give any one leave to *un-king* him who pleased to say he did not *govern* according to *law*! This shews what stress we are to lay upon the *instances* he brings! And does he think that any *scrap* he may meet with in *Lambard* or the *Mirror* can overturn all the *flagrant fact* in the world, and dissolve all our *laws*? But (as you have pinned him down) let him quote our *laws*, and shew any *act of parliament* that establishes *coercion* upon the *crown*, or allows of *resistance* in the *subject* upon any *pretence* whatsoever. And if this be the *foundation* of all *government* (as these men say) why should our *laws* be mealy-mouthed not to *enact* it, and to *declare* it to all the men in *England*, that they may know what *rule* to go by?

Saturday, August 14, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 347.

1. How the *Observer* makes me a *papist*.
2. *Christ* is now a *priest*, and offers a real *sacrifice*, as do his *priests* upon *earth*.
3. The *Observer* denies the holy *sacrament* to be the *body* and *blood* of *Christ*, and justifies the *burning* it by the hands of the common *hangman*.
4. Why they did not make me a *Jew* as well as a *papist*. The *Observer*'s quotation out of the *Regale*.
5. A limited *supremacy* is none at all.
6. The *pope*'s *supremacy* now brought to this.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* of the 7th instant, N. 50. falls heavily upon you, *master*, for some of your *sick-bed thoughts* you gave us, and makes you a very *papist*, because you speak of the *priesthood* of *Christ*, and the *delegated priesthood* he has appointed upon *earth*.

2. R. The *religion* of some men consists all in *negatives*, and think nothing is meant by the word *protestant* but *protesting* against the *pope*; which whoever does (though it were *Turk*, *Pagan*, or *Socinian*) they think him a good *protestant*! and in this *fury* there are those who have run themselves out of *Christianity*, who will allow neither *church* nor *priesthood*. And for fear of the *sacrifice* of the *mass*, will own no *Christian sacrifice* at all! See what a gross notion the *Observer* has of this, when he says, *That to talk of our Saviour, or the priests offering up any more or further sacrifice* — Who says it is any *further* or *more sacrifice* than *Christ* or his *priests* do offer? Or that *Christ* did suffer more than once? But does he not make *intercession* for us, by virtue of that *sacrifice* of himself once offered upon the *cross*, and present before his *Father* his *crucify'd body* and *blood*, to interpose betwixt the *wrath* of *God* and our *sins*? This he continually *offers*, and it is a perpetual *sacrifice*. Is

he not a *priest* for ever? And what other *sacrifice* does he now offer? This is a *real*, though a *commemorative sacrifice*. And so is the same which he has commanded and authorized his *priests* to offer upon *earth*, in *resemblance*, and in *conjunction* with what he in *person* offers in *heaven*. It is his *real body and blood*, which he offers in *heaven*. But his *body* is not there *broken* again, nor his *blood shed*. And if it were the same *body and blood* in all respects, *literally, substantially, and numerically* that is offered in the *holy sacrament*, then would the *body* be *broken*, and the *blood* be *shed* over again every *celebration* of that *sacrament*. This is what is charged upon the *church of Rome*, and their notion of *transubstantiation*. And can the *Observer* see no difference betwixt this and our *commemorative sacrifice*? Or is not a *commemorative* as *real a sacrifice* as the *typical* under the *law*? Is it not a *real*, though a *commemorative sacrifice* that *Christ* offers in *heaven*, of his *holy passion* that is *past*? And is he not in this a *true and real priest*? And are not those *true and real priests*, whom he has *delegated* to offer the same *sacrifice* in *figure and resemblance* upon *earth*? And to shew the *nearness and conjunction* of this with what he in *person* offers in *heaven*, has he not called those *holy symbols* he has *instituted* by the name of his own *body and blood*? But for a fuller account of this subject, see an excellent treatise lately printed, entituled: *Sacrifice the divine Service, from the Covenant of Grace, to the Consummation of the Mystery of Man's Redemption*. By J. Scandred, *Priest of the church of England*. To which is prefixed a letter from the Reverend Mr. Charles Leslie, *Chancellor of the Cathedral of Connor, in the Kingdom of Ireland*.

3. C. Had the *Observer* known any thing of this, he would not have objected to you what he does in the words presently after, concerning what you had said of the burning the *host* at *Edinburgh* by the hands of the common *hangman*, and charges you with *calling the host* carried about the *streets*, *our Saviour's body*.

R. These men seem unacquainted with the holy *scriptures*! Does not *Christ* there call this holy *sacrament* his own *body* and *blood*? Or do they deny the *ordinations* in the *church* of *Rome* to be valid, that their *priests* cannot *consecrate* the holy *sacrament*? And will they put such hideous *contempt* upon it, as to *burn* it by the hands of a common *hangman*! These *monstrous* things do really serve the ends of *popery*. And if there were no *protestants* more sober, would drive all considering men from such *extravagancies* back to *popery* again, that they might retain something of *Christianity*!

4. C. For your own part, *master*, I thought it impossible for any to charge *popery* upon you, after what you had said, N. 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256. They might as easily have made a *Jew* of you, but that a *papist* is a worse name! But he says in the next words, *That you are generally reputed to be the author of a book, entitled, The case of the Regale and Pontificate, and that there, p. 262, 263. there are these words, We should not long quarrel about the pope's supremacy.*

5. R. It is nothing to the *Observer* who is author of that book. But why did he not give us some more of it? Upon what occasion was this said? I desire no more of the reader than to peruse the paragraph, and he will see, that the condition upon which this was said was no less than the *pope's* giving up his whole *supremacy*; that is, to submit to those *limitations* of it which were put by the *Gallican church* in the year 1682. For I do reckon, that a *limited supremacy* is none at all; because nothing can be *limited* but by a *superior*. And whatever has a *superior* is *subject*, and cannot be *supreme*. And the question, *Who shall be judge?* comes in here. I say, you exceed your *supremacy*, you say, not. And whoever is *judge* in this case is *supreme*. If therefore any *national church* can say to the *pope*; your *supremacy* extends not to *this* or *that*, or to the infringement of our particular *customs* or *rules*, I conclude that his *supremacy* is gone in that *church*, since they can *limit* it at their pleasure, and are the ultimate *judge* of their own *customs* and *rules*.

C. You

C. You are certainly in the right, *master*; for what care I for any *supremacy* over me, if I am judge over that *supremacy*? If I can say, *Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further*; then I can stop it *where* and *when* I please. And if you can bring the *pope's supremacy* to this, *we need not long quarrel about it*.

6. R. It seems to be brought to it every where; for the *emperor* now declares the *excommunications* of the *pope* to be null and void. And if he is judge of that, he is judge over the *pope*. And then farewell to *old popery*! and *new popery* will not hold it out long.

Wednesday, August 18, 1708. No. 348.

1. The *Observer* sent to learn his *catechism*.
2. The *dissenters* no friends to *instituted religion*. They run into *enthusiasm*, and give occasion to the *prophaneness* of the age.
3. The *angels of heaven* are reconciled by *Christ*.
4. He stands betwixt *God* and all *creatures*.
5. Yet some think they can go to *God* without him.
6. As we go to *God* by *Christ*, so we go to *Christ* by the ministry of the *priesthood*.
7. We cannot come to *God* merely by our own *thoughts*.
8. This is *enthusiasm*, and more *mischievous* (in many respects) than *atheism*.
9. They who undervalue the *institutions of Christ*, yet set up new ones of their own.

1. Coun. **Y**OU have in your last, *master*, corrected and instructed the *Observer*, that if he has any sense, he ought to begin his *Catechism*, and learn the first rudiments of *Christianity*, before he undertakes to discourse of *religion*.

2. R.

2. R. I did it not for his sake only, but on account of many who having received their *education* among the *dissenters* have never after had a right turn as to *instituted religion*. They have lost all notion of *church* or *priesthood*, they have defaced the *Christian sacrifice*, and made little more of it than a bare *remembrance*, as of an absent friend; which has led the men of the *Rights* to call it a *Grace-cup*, and our *consecrations* to be *conjurations*! And this ever was, and ever will be the effect of depreciating the outward *institutions* of religion. We then run into all wild *enthusiasm*, and think we can approach God directly and immediately, without the *intervention* of any, which is more than the *angels* of *heaven* can do.

3. C. How, *master*, more than the *angels* can do! I thought they could come to God immediately, and needed no *helps*, or any *intervention* betwixt God and them.

R. No, countryman, God is a *light* inaccessible even to them. And they see God in the face of *Jesus Christ*: God chargeth his *angels* with *folly*, and the *heavens* are not *clean* in his sight. And the *apostle* tells us, *Col. i. 20.* That God does reconcile all things unto himself by *Christ*, whether they be things in *earth*, or things in *heaven*. And again, *Eph. i. 10.* That in the *dispensation* of the *fulness* of times he might gather together in one all things in *Christ*, both which are in *heaven*, and which are on *earth*, even in him.

4. C. This is the wonderful effect of the *mediatory kingdom* of *Christ*, in which you have instructed me. He stands betwixt God and all *creatures*; as to *punish* the *wicked*, both *angels* and *men*; for God hath committed all *judgment* unto him, so to bring the *good* nearer unto God, and *reveal* him more unto them, and *reconcile* them more and more unto him, by covering the *follies* of the *angels*, and making *atonement* for the  *sins* of *men*.

5. R. Yet there are *mén*, who think they have neither *sin* nor *folly* to answer for! and that they need no other *mediator* than what they carry in their own  
breasts;

breasts; that is, the *light* that is *within* themselves. And they and others think, that they can go to God directly and immediately, without the *intervention* of any, and that there is none that stands betwixt God and them!

C. Yet the *angels* of *heaven* have need of a *purer* than themselves to stand betwixt the All-pure God and them, and are *reconciled* by *Christ*; but some *men* are too *proud* for this, and think they can *reconcile* themselves!

6. R. And as we cannot approach God immediately, so neither can we *Christ* now in *heaven*. Therefore before he left the earth he *delegated* to others the *commission* which his *Father* had given him, and made them *ministers* of *reconciliation* under him; and gave them power to offer the same propitiatory *sacrifice* in *symbol*, which he in *person* offers in *heaven*. So that as none come to God but through *Christ*; in like manner none come to *Christ* (in the *ordinary* dispensation of the *gospel*) but through the *ministry* of that *priesthood* he has ordained on *earth*, to admit into *heaven* by *baptism*, and to exclude by the power of the *keys*, which he has committed unto them, and promised to *ratify* in *heaven*.

7. C. When a man thinks of God, he thinks as *strongly* as he can, and yet (alas!) how *weak* is it? How *disproportionable*, and every way *unworthy* of the *divine* *majesty*! We can frame no *idea* of God; we grope after him in what we call his *attributes*. And yet how widely do men differ even in these? But we have no *notion* at all of his *person*. Nor do we know any thing of his *dispensations* and *oeconomy* with *mankind*, but what he has *revealed* to us in the *holy scriptures*. Some think he minds nothing of the world, but that *chance* governs all. That he regards not either our *sins* or *virtues*; for that the one cannot *hurt* him, nor the other *profit* him. That our *souls* die like *beasts*, and that there is no future *rewards* or *punishments*. That *power* is the only *measure* of *justice*, and *success* the determiner of God's *approbation*. With many other things you have told me,  
wherein

wherein men measuring *God* by their own *thoughts* of him, have overturned the whole foundation of *nature*, dissolved all *relations* among men, and all notions of *right* or *wrong*. They can make it *right* for *parents* and *princes* to *obey*; and their *children* and *servants* to bear the *rule* over them!

8. Now, *master*, if men can *err* so grossly and so fatally in things that are before us, wherein we have both *nature* and *laws* to direct us; how shall we by our *thoughts* of *God* come to know the things that are in *heaven*, the nature of his *justice*, what *satisfaction* he will require for our *sins*, and how to be *paid*, and the whole *economy* he has ordained for our *salvation*? If we will chalk out the way to *heaven* by our own *thoughts* and *imaginings*, and suppose no more necessary than our inward *commerce* with *God*, we run into all *enthusiasm*. This is very *enthusiasm*, as you have before instructed me; then every thing that comes into our heads is the *inspiration* of *God*! And this supercedes all commands in *scripture*, all ties of *nature*, all human *laws*, and all other things whatsoever! And the dismal effects of this we have seen to exceed even that of *atheism*; for if an *atheist* thinks nothing *unlawful*, the *enthusiast* thinks every thing *lawful* that he *fancies*. Nay, not only *lawful*, but *necessary*, and an *obligation* upon him, and that he sins if he does it not, though it were to *murder* his *father*, to kill his *king*, and run through the land with *fire* and *sword*! no *contradictions* stop him — He pulls down *churches* out of *devotion*! *rebels* out of *loyalty*! and *murders* for *mercy*! And to preserve the reverence due to the *institutions* of *Christ*, he *burns* the holy *sacrament* by the hands of the *hangman*! For these are outward things, and hinder the inward *communication* with *God*!

9. R. But though they run down the *institutions* of *Christ*, they set up new ones of their own. For no *religion* can be without outward *institutions*. Thus when *godly men* have out of pure *zeal* pulled down a *church*, they build a *barn* for the same use! And they who despise  
the

the covenant of grace, set up a *league* and covenant in its place! They erect a *pope* in every *parish*, to avoid one *bishop* in a *diocese*. They persecute for liberty of conscience, yet damn all toleration! They abhor idols, and commit sacrilege!

---

Saturday, August 21, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 349.

---

1. The *Christian sacrifice* vindicated from the least favouring of *transubstantiation*.
2. Yet it must be *popery*!
3. The *Observer* charges some of our *divines* of favouring *popery*, but clears the *church* of *England*.
4. Which quite spoils his *merry tale* of forbidding the *banns*.
5. Another *story* for his, of the *cruelty* of the *bishops* in bowing at the name of *Jesus*.
6. Why we bow at that *name* rather than at the *name* of *God*, or of *Christ*.
7. This not *necessary*, but highly *decent* and *fitting*.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Christian sacrifice*, as you have explained it, *master*, is so far from favouring *transubstantiation*, as the *Observer* foolishly objects, that it totally destroys it, and stands in the utmost opposition to it, insomuch that both cannot be true; for if it be the very *body* and *blood* of *Christ*, then it is not *representative*, or *symbolical*, or *figurative*, as you have said it is: and therefore it was either *stupidity* or *malice* to arraign this doctrine as favouring of *popery*.

R. Nay further, *countryman*, if *transubstantiation* were true, it would follow that the *priest* does more on *earth* than *Christ* does in *heaven*; for though *Christ* there offers and presents his *body* and *blood*, yet his *body* is not broken, nor his *blood* shed over again, as is done in the *mass*, supposing *transubstantiation*; and it is really a *bloody sacrifice*, if that be *real blood*.

2. C. Set your heart at rest, *master*, while you talk of *church* or *priesthood*, you are and must be a *papist*, or worse, if they knew what, to those who have *neither*, and yet would *pretend* to *both*; and they would let none enjoy what they want.

3. But come, *master*, and defend the *church* of *England*. The *Observer* of the 7th instant, *Num.* 50. quotes Dr. *Heylin*, saying, that some of her *divines* were suspected as favourers of *popery*.

R. And what then? what if it were so said now? But in the same *Observer* he clears the *church* of *England*, and says, *That in her homilies she asserts the church of Rome to be guilty of idolatry.*

4. C. Yet presently after he tells a merry story of one who forbid the banns of matrimony betwixt the church of *Rome* and of *England*, as being too near of kin.

R. That's an old story, I remember it since I was a child; the *dissenters* love to repeat their own *jest*s, but, like *Bayes*, they forget how to apply them, and the *Observer* has spoiled it in the telling, it was a *jest* when he heard it—but it is perfectly *dull*, when in the same breath he says, that the *church* of *England* charges the *church* of *Rome* of *idolatry*, for this puts them quite out with *kin*.

5. C. But he says, that when king *Charles I.* (then prince of *Wales*) went to *Spain*, his father king *James I.* "With the advice of his bishops, whereof *Laud* was one, did order that those of the prince's chapel should adorn it chapelwise with an altar, font, linnen coverings, demy carpet, surplices, &c. that every one present should kneel at due time, stand up at the creed and gospels, and bow at the name of *Jesus*."

R. That was cruel! as an old *dissenter* told a friend of mine, that the *bishops* were *cruel* folks. Why? said my friend, what *cruelty* have they done? have they killed any body? No, said the *dissenter*, but they are all for bowing at the name of *Jesus*—O, they are *cruel* folks!

6. C. But now it comes in thus accidentally, I would desire you, *master*, to give me an answer to the dissent-

ers when they ask, why do you bow at the name of *Jesus*, more than at the name of *God*, or of *Christ*?

R. The word *Jesus* signifies a *Saviour*, and is the proper name of our *Saviour*, who had this name given him by the *angel* before he was conceived in the womb, so that this is his *personal* name. The word *Christ* denotes only his *office*, as he was the *anointed* of *God*, which that word signifies.

Now there were in the *apostles* time a set of *hereticks*, as *Cerintus* and his followers, who denied *Jesus* to be the *Christ*. They said that *Christ* or the *Holy Spirit* (for they made no distinction) dwelt in *Jesus*, as in other holy men. That it descended upon him at his *baptism*, but left him on the *cross*, which made him cry, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Against these the *apostles* wrote. And the burden of their arguments was to prove that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, as *St. Peter* said (*Act. ii. 36.*) *Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.* And *St. John* says (*John xx. 31.*) *These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God.* And (*1 John ii. 22.*) *Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?* Wherefore *St. Paul* says (*Phil. ii. 10.*) *That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow.* This was owning him to be the *Christ*, which is truly to be a *Christian*, and the bowing at any other name does not shew this. To bow at the name of *God* does not distinguish me from a *Jew*, a *Mahometan*, or an *Heathen*, who all acknowledge a *God*. And to bow at the name of *Christ* or the *Messiah* does not shew but that I may be a *Jew*, for they own a *Christ*, and expect him yet to come, but they deny that *Jesus* is the *Christ*. And (*alas!*) we have the same cause of distinguishing our selves here in *England* at this day, where many that shelter themselves under the name of *Christians* (ay, and good *protestants* too) are professed *deists*, and blaspheme that worthy name by which we are called, saying, *That the old Romans served him right to punish him with the death of a slave*; which I have before quoted out

out of *The Growth of Deism*, approved and recommended in the book of the *Rights*, and we shall not distinguish our selves from these by *bowing* at the name of God. Then again the *quakers* do expressly deny the man *Jesus* to be the *Christ*, they run in directly with the *heresy* of *Cerintus*, and say that *Christ* or the *light* dwelt in *Jesus*, they make *Christ* and *Jesus* to be two; therefore *bowing* at the name of *Christ* will not distinguish us from these. But *bowing* at the name of *Jesus* is owning that person that *Man Jesus* to be the *Christ*; and nothing less than this can denominate a man to be a *Christian*.

7. I say not it is necessary or an article of faith always to bow at the name of *Jesus*; but I hope I may say from the authorities and reasons I have offered, that there can be no harm in it, far less any *superstition*; that it is highly decent, and a profession of our *Christianity*; and that who refrain from it out of a principle, give grounds of suspicion that they are not sound in the faith, and lean more to the *deists*, or principles of the *quakers*, than to the *Christian church*; at least they give countenance to these enemies of *Christianity*, while they join with them in refusing this publick attestation which the church gives of her faith in the crucified *Jesus*. We bow or uncover our selves at the name of an earthly king, when his grants or patents are read; and may we not bow at the name of the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords!

---

Wednesday, August 25, 1708. No. 350.

---

1. The deformity of holiness among the *presbyterians*.
2. Their burning the holy sacrament as a *popish* trinket.
3. Why they think burning the covenant more heinous than burning the body of Christ.
4. Their homely familiarity with God.
5. Why they are uncovered and kneel at their family prayers, but not in their public meetings, with the manner of their public prayers.
6. How they are mended of late.
7. The extempore prayers first set up by the *popish* emissaries.
8. The blasphemies and blunders in their prayers.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* of the 7th instant, Num. 50. is very angry with king James I. and makes little less than a *papist* of him for ordering that the chapel of prince Charles (when in Spain) should be adorned chapel-wise, with altar, font, &c.

R. The *Observer* would have had it barn-wise, with a long table (like shuffle-board or ordinary) in the middle, and instead of a font, a sullibub-pot, as the *presbyterians* used in the days of purity! and a fidler's gray cloak in lieu of a surplice! or a buff-coat, with a pair of side-pistols laid across the cushion, as has been seen in the days of reformation! This would have made an edifying figure in Spain, and given them a worthy notion of the protestant religion, when they had seen it in the deformity of holiness!

2. C. It would have added mightily to this, if they had seen some protestants reckon the holy sacrament among *popish* trinkets, deny it to be the body and blood of Christ, and cause it to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman.

R. What

R. What a noise they made about burning their traitorous *covenant*? This was *profane* and all sorts of *wickedness*! but they justify burning the holy *sacrament*, which *Christ* calls his own *body* and *blood*!

C. There was a reason for that, for the *covenant* was an *idol* of their own making; the other was only the *institution* of *Christ*. And you know it is an old saying, That a man may make *bold* with his *friends*.

4. R. And sometimes more *bold* than *welcome*, is as old a saying, and as true. But these men think the more *bold* the more *welcome*, they love to be *homely* with *God*! and will scarce allow him a *bat* or a *knee* when they come into his presence! I know not how they do now (for I come not near them *Num. xvi. 26.*) but I have formerly seen in their *meetings* some sit upon their *tails* at *prayer* with their *bats* on their heads, others pull them over their eyes, others hang them upon one ear like a *peg*, and give *God* half a *bat*.

5. C. And yet at *family-prayers* in their own *houses* they are all *uncovered* and *kneel*, as I am credibly informed, why then should they not do it in *publick*?

R. To shew the difference betwixt *them* and the *church*. And how much more *familiar* they are with *God Almighty* than the *episcopal* folks dare presume! if the *church* should do as they do, they would quit it, and do as the *church* now does.

*Still so perverse and opposite,  
As if they worship'd God for spite.*

And it was purely in opposition to our *liturgy*, and to prejudice men against it (for they were resolved to *quarrel*) that they set up the *extempore* way; and instead of that *form* of *sound words*, and the *majesty* of our *offices*, they introduced the most *nasty* and *slowly* method of *worship* (by way of *familiarity*) treating the *Almighty* with *beastly* and *kitchen* language, sending him on their *errands*, and bidding him make a *step* to this or that place, and do so and so for them, and they would be as good to him

him another way, and do so and so for him. They used to tell him all the *news* of the town in their *prayers*, and bid him beware of such a man, for that he was not *sound at heart*, but that he might safely *trust* such and such, whom they recommended to him! You may see a fulsome *load* of this in the *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, great part of which is collected out of Mr. *Rutherford's letters*, which they will not disown. They were thus described by a *poet* of those times,

Have we told *Providence* what it must do,  
Whom to *avoid*, and whom to *trust* unto?  
And made *pray'rs* not so like *petitions*,  
As *overtures* and *propositions*!

6. C. But I am told they are much cured of that now, especially here in *London*, where they have learned to speak with more *decency*.

R. I know not; but this I am sure of, that several go to hear *Daniel Burges* as to a *farce*, and seldom miss of the *entertainment* they expect. I have been told a multitude of *stories* of his *preachments* from those who heard him. And some who have been in his company say he is a man of *sense* and good *conversation*, and that being asked why he would play the *buffoon* in the *pulpit*, and speak such *ridiculous* things? he made *answer*, that if he did it not he should lose his *congregation*, for that they were pleased with that *familiar* way of speaking of *God*, and the *homely* comparisons. So that they have not all lost the taste of their *mother's milk*, I may call it, of the *low* and *sordid* way wherein they have been *educated*.

7. C. But, *master*, I have been told that it was the *popish emissaries* who first set up the *extempore* way among us.

R. That is most true, you will find a particular and authentick account in *Foxes and Firebrands* of *Heath* and *Cummin*, who were detected to be *popish-priests*, after they had *preached* as *puritans* in queen *Elizabeth's* time,  
and

and railed most against the *liturgy* as a *dead form*, and recommended the *extempore prayers* as being the only *spiritual* and *acceptable service*; and there are many other the like instances. These the *puritans* followed; and so have kept it on to this day.

8. C. And the many *blasphemies* and horrid *blunders* that slip from them in their *extempore* haste has not been able to cure them. I heard one of them in the heat of his *prayer* cry out, O Lord *Jesus Christ*, for thy dear Son's sake—and he repeated it over several times, but in an hour after he denied to me that he had said so, and I produced several witnesses, till we convinced him; so that they speak without thinking! Some have taken their *prayers* in *short-hand*, and after some time have shewed it them as a *form of prayer* recommended to them; and themselves have found out and exposed their own *blasphemies* and *nonsense*, not knowing it to be their own.

---

Saturday, August 28, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 351.

---

1. A vindication of Sir Roger L' Estrate from the aspersions of the *Observer*.
2. The *Observer's* care for the inferior clergy.
3. His fresh effort to prove the *coercive power of parliaments* over the crown.
4. All his *proofs* are quite *wide* of the point.
5. The authority of *Bracton* will not do. Lord chief justice *Coke* veered about.
6. The authority of *Bracton* against coercion.

1. Coun. THE *Observer* we were last upon, Num. 50. says to his countryman,

" I hope what we have said will be a warning to people how they follow the dictates of the *Rehearser*, and his high-church; for 'tis plain enough that he will prove as fatal a guide to our inferior clergy, if any of them be such fools to follow him, as Sir Roger L' Estrate was, for he broaches the same principles

VOL. V. I " of

“ of slavery ; and to me it appears, that he has as large,  
 “ or rather a larger tincture of popery than Sir Roger.

R. I take it as an honour that he joins me with Sir Roger L' Estrange, who stem'd the tide against the rebellious *whigs* and *dissenters* of those times, and confounded them with a superiority of *wit* and *argument* ; and it may be said of him, that he did more service (and in this method too) both to *church* and *state* than most writers (if any is to be excepted) in that age, and the *clergy* in particular were obliged to do him honour, for he asserted their cause with great success. I confess I have followed him, *sed non passibus æquis* ; and the objection of *popery* against him was only by those *foul mouths* which he had stop'd from every thing but *railing* and *lying*. He died as he lived a good *protestant* of the *church* of England, which he vindicated. And these are worse than *papists* to the *dissenters*.

2. C. But why is the *Observer*'s care limited to the *inferior clergy* ? Have not the *bishops* (does he think) as much *wit* or *honesty* ? And cannot they discern *reason* and *argument* as well as the *inferior clergy* ? And does he not know, that the *bishops* had as great regard for Sir Roger L' Estrange as any of the *inferior clergy* ? And they had as much reason, for he wrote in their defence as of the others, for their *cause* is the same. The *bishops* are all made out of the *inferior clergy*, so that if they be *right*, the *bishops* cannot long be *wrong*. And here the *Observer* thinks the danger lies, that you have begun at the fountain.

R. This is a reflection upon the *clergy*, my business is to learn from them, not to teach them ; but the *Observer*'s tongue is no *slander* in a *party-cause* against the *church*.

3. C. Well then, there let us leave it. But, *master*, it is time now that you say something to the remainder of this *Observer*, N. 50. and likewise to Num. 52. of the 14. instant, wherein he *bounces* like a *beefor*, and says he has for ever *pegg'd* you down, as to the point of the *coercive power* of the *parliament* over the *crown* by our *laws*

*laws.* And I assure you his *party* boast that you are quite overthrown; and others think you are hard put to it, and are in suspense how you will get over it, therefore you must not slip it.

R. I was willing to stay till I could see the utmost of their force. The *Observer* has consulted the best *lawyers* of his *party*, you may see the hand of *Joab* in it; and I believe they have no more to say upon the point: so that if I can give but a fair *answer* to this, I suppose we shall be troubled no more with this *dispute*, unless the *Observer* (when left to himself) shall *rave* and *rail* as his *predecessor* did.

4. And now for my *answer*. The first thing I say is, that there is not one word of what is produced in these *Observers* that is to the purpose, more than if I indicted *Jack*, and brought all my proof against *James*. You know our dispute was concerning the *laws* of the land; and of these I gave a good many which asserted the authority of the *crown* to be derived from *God* alone, and to be in no *earthly subjection*, and expressly condemning all *coercive* power over the *king*, either in *parliament* or *people*. See *Num.* 94. And I told Mr. *Observer*, and gave him caution, that it would be but *trifling* to produce any lesser authorities against these. I put the issue upon the *laws*, and so I do still, against all the *lawyers* he can consult. And now what is it they have produced as *law* against me? Why, some private *authors* and *books*, and old *histories*, as *Ingulphus* abbot of *Croyland*, *Lambard*, and *Bracton*. But are these our *laws*? Is every word they said the *laws* of the land? Can they be pleaded as *law* in *Westminster-Hall*?

5. C. But he says that *Bracton* was *lord chief justice* of *England* in the reign of king *Henry III.*

R. And what then? we can tell him of another *chief justice* who had his *skin* stuffed with *chopt-straw*.

Those were troublous and rebellious times; and who knows how chief justice *Bracton* might be inclined as to the *royal* or the *factions* side? And he might have changed *sides*, and so contradicted what he had wrote

before, as our *oracle* of the law chief justice Coke did, who, while in favour at court, wrote highly for the *prerogative*; but after he was in disgrace, he sought to lessen it all that he could. And these *inconsistencies* are to be seen in his books, that you may know by their *strain* when they were wrote, whether when he was *pleased* or *angry* with the court.

6. Therefore I trouble not my self to examine the quotations the *Observer* brings out of *Bracton*, because they are nothing to the purpose, be what they will. But yet I will tell him what I remember in *Bracton*; he puts the case, what if the king do *wrong*? Then he says the *ministers* are to be punished, for that the law says, *The king can do no wrong*. But what if the king will not suffer his *ministers* to be called to account? Then, says *Bracton*, he may be *supplicated* and humbly entreated, and the *evil* represented to him. But what if all this will not do, but the king still *persists*? In that case *Bracton* says, *Sufficit ei pro pœna quod Deum expectet ultorem, nam superiorem non habet in terris*; that is, we must refer him to the judgment of God, for that he has no superior upon earth.

C. Let the *Observer* now take up his *Bracton*—and whether he can reconcile him to himself or not, it is all one to you, *master*, for you go upon a surer foundation, the known and established laws of the land.

Wednesday, September 1, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 352.

1. The opinion of a *lord chief justice* is not *law*.
2. Far less *Lambard* or *Ingulphus*. The folly of quoting a *history* against an *act of parliament*.
3. Or pleading that the *parliament* was *pack'd*.
4. The *nonsense* of the *Observer* in saying that the *statute* 12 Car. II. is *antiquated*, shewed from 30. *January*, and the *proclamation*.
5. No *act of parliament* can be *antiquated*.
6. An answer to king *Jahn* and his son *Henry* granting *coercion* over themselves.
7. The *barons-wars* more fatal to *England* than the *tyranny* of all their *kings*.
8. Brought as *precedents* for fresh *rebellion* now.
9. They argue the *law* from the *consent of kings*, whose *opinion* they will not yet allow to be *law*.
10. They make it *law* if against the *king*, but not if for him.

1. Coun. I Believe the *Observer* wishes he had not brought the *lord chief justice Bracton* into the play, for he speaks expressly against *coercion*.

R. If he had spoke never so much for it, it had been all nothing to the purpose, as I have shewed. Will the *whig-lawyers* grant, that whatever a *lord chief justice* says or writes is *law*? The 41 *parliament* would not take the opinion of both the *chief justices* and of all the *judges* in *England* for the legality of *ship-money*.

2. C. Then far less can *Lambard*, or *Ingulphus*, abbot of *Croyland*, be quoted as the *laws* of the *land*.

R. He will say he quotes them only as *historians*.

C. As *historians*? And can an *historian* be brought in contradiction to an *act of parliament*? Suppose a *lawyer* in *Westminster-Hall* should quote an *act of parliament*, and another should in answer quote *Lambard* or *Ingulphus* saying there was no such *act*, and that they

ought to be believed rather than our *Book of Statutes*; What would the *court* say to such a *lawyer*? I suppose he would never get another *fee*.

3. R. But he has another way to get over these *acts of parliament* I have quoted, he says, N. 52. that he excepts against those *laws made by mercenary and pack'd parliaments, in the reign of king Charles II.*

C. Let me to him, *master*, I fancy I can battle him and all his *lawyers* upon this point. Suppose then, as I said before, an *act of parliament* is quoted in *Westminster-Hall*, and the *council* on the other side should say, that this is no *law*, because it was made by a *mercenary and packed parliament*. Would he not be *booted out of the hall*? Would not this be to overthrow and destroy all our *laws* at once, when every one shall take upon him to *judge* which is a *mercenary and packed parliament*? And may not I say the same of other *acts of parliament* he quotes? And where will be the end of all this?

Besides you quoted several other *acts of parliament* in the reigns of *Rich. II. Hen. VIII. queen Eliz. and king Jam. I.* were all these *packed parliaments* too? Then farewell our *Book of Statutes*!

4. R. But he says that *act* you quoted of 12 *Car. II. c. 30.* is antiquated by the *revolution-acts* made since.

C. If he had said *repealed*, then he must have shewed those *acts* that *repeal* it; but to say *antiquated* is *nonsense*. Is an *act* of king *Char. II.* antiquated, and not that of *Rich. II.* and others made by his *predecessors*? But why is this particular *act* antiquated more than all the other *acts* in that reign; this *act*, I say, by virtue of which we keep the 30. of *January* to this day? And have not our *clergy* in the publick churches read the *proclamation* enjoined the *Sunday* before? And is this *act* antiquated?

5. R. Besides, *countryman*, no *act of parliament* can be antiquated, or lose its force by length of time. Nothing can dissolve an *act of parliament* but its being *repealed* by *parliament*. Some old *acts of parliament* may be forgotten, and worn into *disuse*. And there have been

been proclamations for reviving some of these; not that the proclamation adds any force to them, but only that the people have notice of it, and not be ensnared by transgressing them ignorantly, which would be needless if they were antiquated in the sense of the *Observer*, that is, were of no more force.

6. C. But Num. 50. he quotes a charter of king John's granting, *That the barons and community of the land shall straiten and compel us by all means possible, as by seizing our towns, lands, and possessions, or any other way, till satisfaction be made according to their pleasure.* And that in the charter of his son Henry, upon supposition of his not performing the agreements, 'tis said, *It shall be lawful for all men in our kingdom to rise up against us, and to do all things that may be grievous to us, as if they were absolutely free from any engagements to our persons.*

R. Here the *Observer* shews himself! for he could not but know, that all this was done in open and flagrant rebellion, and when these kings were subdued and conquered by their traiterous and disloyal barons, and forced to sign or do whatever they required of them.

7. C. This was what they called the *barons-wars*. I have read something of it in our history, and it makes good all that you have laid down to us, master, from the beginning, that rebellion is a bad cure for tyranny; for England suffered more ruin and devastation by these *barons-wars*, than from all those kings they called tyrants that ever had reigned before.

8. R. But these rebellious barons are now called patriots and the noble assertors of our liberties and properties! and here you see precedents are brought from them for coercion, and to serve our kings (or queens) in the same fashion, to murder or depose them at pleasure! comfortable doctrine for monarchs, for her majesty to hear!

9. C. But I would ask a question, master, suppose these kings had granted these concessions without any coercion upon them, but freely and voluntarily of their mere good will and pleasure; ay, and I will suppose too,

that these *kings* were really of this *opinion*, for *coercion* over themselves; will the *whigs* then allow, that the *opinion* of the *king* is *law*? Why else do they bring these *concessions* to prove, that *coercion* is *law* in *England*?

10. *R.* Their meaning is, that all *acts* and *deeds* of *kings* against their own *right* and *interest* shall be binding upon them, and shall be good *law*. But if they assert their *right*, and just and lawful *prerogative*, given to them by the *law* of *God*, and recogniz'd by all the *laws* of the *land*, then they are *tyrants*, set up for *arbitrary power*, and their *opinion* is of no force at all, far less is it *law*!

Saturday, Sept. 4, 1708.

Nº 353.

1. By the *Observer's* argument for *coercion*, the *pope* has still the *dominion* over *England*.
2. The argument of *Lambard* is grounded upon the *pope's* universal *supremacy*, which the *Observer* calls *bonest*, and *admires* it.
3. The *deposing* doctrine, and power of the *people* are rank *popery*, testify'd by the *Lord bishop* of *Sarum*.
4. Shewed in *Two sticks made one*.
5. A *king* deposed, *propter inutile imperium*.
6. Other instances of *popes* assisting *sons* to *depose* their *father*.
7. The *Germans* more zealous *papists* than the *French*.

1. *R.* **I** Have a word more yet to say to the *Observer*. He argues for the lawfulness of *coercion* over the *king* from the *concession* which *king John* gave; that is, was forced to give to his *barons*. Will not the same argument hold for the subjection of the *crown* of *England* at this day to the *pope*? For *king John* did surrender it to him. If you say, that the *surrender* was an *unjust* act, and betraying the right of the *crown*, and so *void*. So say I, of his granting *coercion* to the *barons*

*barons* ever himself. Did the *pope* force him to this? So did the *barons*. May his *successors* justly rescue themselves and the *crown* from this *encroachment* of the *pope*? So may they from this *rebellion* of the *barons*. I desire the *Observer* to try if he can find any disparity in these cases, and then what a fine spot of work has he made, that if his argument for *coercion* will hold, then the *pope* must have *England*! He has as good a *title* to it as either *lords* or *commons*, or the *people* have for *coercion* over the *king*.

2. C. There is one thing, *maister*, pray let me take notice of it. In the *Observer* we have been upon, N. 50. which makes this argument from the *concession* of king *John* to his *barons*, there is a long quotation out of *Lamhard's Saxon Laws*, shewing that the *king* loses the name of *king*, if he do not govern so and so. But it seems all to be built upon the *authority* which the *popes* did then assume over *kings*; for thus it is there said:

"As *pope John* testifies, the name of *king* he loses, "to whom *Pepin*, and his son *Charles*, not yet *kings*, "but *princes* under a foolish *French king*, wrote, to "know if the *French kings* ought to continue so content only with the royal name,"

This shews it went higher than as being a *Saxon law*; for the *French* were not concerned with that. And their writing to the *pope* about it, shews that it was grounded upon that universal *supremacy* which the *pope* then claimed over all *kings*, even in *temporals*, and to dispose of their *crowns*. And this is confirmed by the answer the *pope* gave to these *French princes*, where after setting down what the *king* should do, he concludes thus:

"All these things the *king* ought to do in his own "person, looking upon and touching the holy *gospels*; "and to *swear* upon the holy *reliques*, before the "kingdom, priesthood, and clergy, before he be owned by the arch-bishops and bishops, &c."

Upon which the *Observer* says: *I admire the plainness and honest simplicity of those times.* Here he calls the very dregs of popery a plainness and honest simplicity which he admires. If you had said half so much, *master*, he would have made you twenty papists.

3. R. Your observation is just, *countryman*. And these precedents the *Observer* brings are not only of popish times, but upon popish principles. The deposing doctrine and power of the people are both popish. They were first set up (as the bishop of Sarum says excellently well) by the assertors of the pope's supremacy; for thus they argu'd, that the pope representing the whole catholic church, this power of the people was devolved upon him, and so he might depose kings at his pleasure. And he shews, with great strength of reason, that this power were better in the pope, than in the people. All which I have quoted to you before, *countryman*.

4. C. I remember it well, *master*. And I have likewise got that sheet you recommended to me, entituled, *Two sticks made One*, or, *The Devil upon Dun*, and have hung it up in my hall. And it serves my country neighbours instead of many books; for there they see the principles of the Jesuits and the presbyterians in two columns one over-against the other, saying the same words, that the one is but a transcript of the other. So that we see the rock out of which the wobigs and presbyterians were hewed, and the pit out of which they were digged: And whence our principle of resistance came, the deposing of kings, and the power of the people. These were first set up among Christians by the papists; and they who rail at popery lick up their spittle.

5. R. And Lambard in his *Saxon Laws*, as quoted by the *Observer*, tells us of two French princes asking the pope if they might not depose their father, because he was foolish, and that he should be contented only with the royal name? And the pope determines that he shall not retain so much as the name of king. And for want of other crimes (for he was a virtuous and a pious man) *propter inutile imperium*, because he was too mild, a

*chip in pottage, and a cypher upon the throne, letting others manage, and do what they will. And this is the example which the Observer proposes to us for imitation!*

6. C. And he can give instances since that time of innocent popes, who have joined with godly sons to depose their father, and the saints consenting and abetting!

R. They will join with the pope or the devil to depose their king — And let the pope but give them leave to call him a *whore*, they will follow all his commands, maintain his principles, and be his *under-spur-leathers* to undermine and destroy the church of England. They will make him head of their confederacy, and fight under his banner, to restore his supremacy in France.

7. C. I have heard indeed, that France has always contested the pope's supremacy, and have had many bickerings with the court of Rome upon that head. But I have not heard the like of our Saxon popish progenitors, whom the Observer would have us follow.

Wednesday, Sept. 8, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 354.

1. Every body has *liberty of conscience* but the *king*.
2. The *subjects* are *free-born*, but not the *king*. The *king* has no *right* or *inheritance*, and we can do him no *wrong*.
3. The *Lutherans* and *papists* much the same as to *doctrines*. The difference betwixt the *episcopal* and *presbyterian Lutherans*.
4. The *Observer*'s reply to my answer, as to the *charter* of king *John*.
5. It is rank *treason*, and makes the *queen* to be a *tyrant*, and an *usurper*.
6. And all the *kings* and *queens* since the beginning of our *Statute-book*.
7. He proposes to our imitation the example of a *papist* and *treasonable* arch-bishop of *Canterbury*.
8. The *pope* the great *fautor* of *rebellion*, even down to our *times*.

1. Coun. **B**Y what you have said formerly, *master*, it appears a strange thing to me, that they who plead for *liberty of conscience*, as the *unalienable right* of every *man* born into the world, should yet deny it to *kings* and *princes*! That they must either lose their *souls*, or their *crowns*! And that the *presbyterians* should maintain this argument, whose own *Confession of faith* declares, *chap. 23*. "That difference in religion, or even *infidelity*, does not take away the *right* of a *king* to *his crown*!" Do they not *believe* what they call the *Confession* of their *faith*? Or did they put it upon the world for a *banter*?

2. Is it a *persecution* to deny a *dissenter* a good place on account of his *persuasion*, and none to take a *crown* from him, for the same reason! Is this against the *right* of a *free-born subject*, but not against the *right* of a *free-born*

born king? Or are none *free-born* but *subjects*; that is, born *free* in *subjection*! And are *kings* born *subjects*, and so not *free*! Have the *subjects* their *rights* and *inheritances*, and has the *king* no *right* at all, or any *inheritance*? Then *wrong* may be done to any body but to the *king*! And instead of the old *maxim* of our *law*, that *the king can do no wrong*, it must be in the new edition, that *no wrong can be done to the king*.

R. I must stop you, *countryman*; for just now is sent me the *Observer* of 21. last month, N. 54. which I have not yet seen; for I am out of the way, and meet with them but by chance, and late. It is full of old-new charges upon me; and I must say something to him.

3. C. But pray, *master*, first answer me one question, how it comes that the *Lutheran princes* in *Germany* are so very loose in their *religion*, and near of kin to *popery*; whereas I am told they are much more firm in *Denmark* and *Sweden*, where they are *Lutherans* too.

R. Do you know the difference betwixt *transubstantiation* and *consubstantiation*?

C. One is *trans*, and the other is *con*, the rest of the word is the *same*. And to us *English* folks they seem to be very near a kin.

R. So near a kin then they are to *popery*, as to the *doctrine*; but as to the *government* of the *church* there is a great difference. For in *Denmark* and *Sweden* they are *episcopal*, and have *bishops* and *archbishops*; but the *Lutheran princes* in *Germany* are *presbyterians*, and have no *bishops*. And this is one reason why they are more indifferent even as to the *doctrine*; for the *discipline* of the *church* is the best guard for the *doctrine*, as has been always found. And the great *errors* and *heresies* that now vex *Christendom*, have come in by the *usurpation* first of the *pope*, and then of the *sectaries*, upon the ancient primitive and apostolical *episcopacy*.

C. I thank you, *master*. And of all *Lutherans* keep me from the *presbyterian* sort, for that is wrong every way. But we are akin to the *Athenians*, we love *new* things, and repent them *late*.

4. R. Now

4. R. Now then I'll go on with the *Observer*, N. 54. One half of it is upon the *priesthood* and the *sacrament*, the other upon *government* and *coercion* over the *crown*. I will begin with the latter, because it continues the subject we were last upon. I call his arguments *new-old* ones; for they are the same over and over again. He sets down a *letter* sent him, and gives many thanks to the *sender*, for the *charter* of king *John* to his *barons*, which he had set down before, N. 50. and which I have already answered.

C. But there is something *new*; for he repeats your *answer*, and *replies* to it. He says, you object, *That those liberties were obtained by rebellion*. To which he says, *that those liberties were never denied but in times of tyranny and usurpation*.

5. R. I say they are *denied* at this day. And is this *reign* a time of *tyranny* and *usurpation*? Let the *Observer* look to it: Does the *queen* allow her *barons* or *commons* to take *arms* against her, to seize her *castles*, *forts*, *towns*, *lands*, and *possessions*, and to *compel* her by *force* to do what they think *reason*, and to *punish* her if they think she *transgresses* the *law*? Will not the *law* make any attempt of this sort to be *treason*? Will the *Observer* venture to try his hand? And are not the *laws* against *coercion* in force in this *reign*? Therefore, according to the *Observer*, this is a time of *tyranny* and *usurpation*. And is not this to call the *queen* a *tyrant* and an *usurper*? I will not descant what *punishment* is due to this; but I think it impossible for the *Observer* to clear himself of this.

3. C. You have him fast, *master*, I would not for my best *cow* he had so much to say against you. And if you have quoted the *statutes* right (of which I suppose you are pretty sure) not only her present *majesty*, but all our *kings* and *queens*, since the beginning of our *Statute-book*, have been *tyrants* and *usurpers*; nay, and our *parliaments* too, who have asserted the *crown* to hold only of *God*, and damned all *coercion* over it. And for his *charter* of king *John*, it makes no more than if he

he had quoted the *murder of Edward II. Richard II. or of king Charles I.* and pleaded these as *precedents* for us to follow at this day. A very good *subject* to queen Anne! Is he not? And she is safest with men of such *principles*!

7. R. But he quotes from Dr. Brady, "That the archbishop of *Canterbury* acquainted the Lords, that he had found a charter of king *Henry I.* by which, if they would, they might assert their liberties they had a long time lost; and that they all swore in presence of the archbishop, that they would strive to death for those liberties."

C. A fine stick of wood that *archbishop*! A *papist*, I warrant him! For all our *protestant bishops* of *Canterbury* have been *loyal* to their *prince*, and in his distress suffered with him. No *conspiracy* against the king was ever formed or countenanced at *Lambeth* since the *reformation*.

8. R. You see by this, that the *popes* in those times abetted the *rebellion* of the *barons* against their *king*. As they did the *holy league* in *France* against king *Hen. III.* and its younger brother the *solemn league and covenant* in *Britain* against king *Charles I.* And generally all *rebellions*, to name no more, or come nearer our own times! And these are the *examples* the *Observer* would have us to follow!

Saturday, Sept. 21, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 355.

1. The *Observer*'s supposed original contracts betwixt our Saxon ancestors and their first kings, whom he says they created.
2. The folly of king *Vertigern* in letting a German prince come over hither, who depos'd him, and enslaved the Britains. This prince (*Hengist*) was not chosen by the Saxons, but he chose them. As it is with generals of armies, and leaders of colonies.
3. The *Observer* thinks, that colonies were planted like wild cats. The folly to suppose, that conquerors will submit themselves to the conquered.
4. The *Observer* cannot shew his original contract, the Saxons were papists at the time *Lambard* speaks of. But when they came into England they were heathens. Therefore he speaks not of their first kings, or how they were created.
5. The authority of *Lambard*, and the Saxon laws.
6. *Lambard* asserts the king to be the vice-gerent of God.
7. And so not appointed by the people. The pope's claim over kings, and the people's claim.
8. *Lambard* says the king is to govern the people. Then the people cannot govern him.
9. The *Observer* has not translated *Lambard* right, and leaves out material words. *Lambard*'s true meaning. He says nothing of the power of the people to depose the king.

1. *Coun.* **T**HE *Observer* you are upon of the 21<sup>st</sup> last month, N. 54. concludes thus: "And in short, those laws were so far from being originally obtained by force, though they were sometimes re-covered by it, that they were the original contract agreed upon betwixt our Saxon ancestors and their kings, when they first created them."

2. R. When

2. R. When was that? good Mr. *Observer*. Did not a *Saxon prince* come over hither, and by *fraud* and *force* got the kingdom to himself! That *German prince* came over hither to help the *king* to govern. But I remember well we could never get him out again! He brought some men with him, and quickly sent for more of his *Germans*; for he would not trust the *Britains*. And then he deposed silly king *Vortigern*, who had invited him into *Britain*, and conquered the country. The *Saxons* were as much conquerors as the *Normans*; and we may as well say, that the *Normans* chose *William the conqueror*, as that the *Saxons* chose *Hengist*. Was he not their prince when he brought them over? And though he might have many others in his army besides his own people, as *William of Normandy* had, yet can it be said that they chose him to be their *general*, or that he chose them to be his *soldiers*? Did our army now in *Flanders* chuse the duke of *Marlborough* to be their *general*? He may *lift* or *reject*, and that offers himself to a *soldier*. So that he *chuses* them, not they him: And thus it was when colonies went abroad, and *peopled* or *conquered* other countries; they were under government and leaders who had the command over them.

3. But the *Observer* thinks, that when colonies came into countries, they leap'd in, like cats scrambling over a wall, all independent, and every one free, and that every thing they could catch was their own; till for their own convenience they chose whom they thought fit to be their king, and under such limitations as they pleased to impose. All which is dream and romance; the *Saxon princes*, as well as *William the conqueror*, let them know there was no such matter; and that none of them had any title to what he possessed, but by grant from the prince. The general has the dividing of the spoil. Does he think that any conqueror will leave it to those he has subdued, whether he shall be their king or not? Will my Lord *Marlborough* put it to the vote in *Brussels*, whether the *French* or the *confederates* shall have it? And yet for all that, we fight for their liberties! But every

one is not a good judge of his own liberty, he often mistakes it!

4. C. But there is no disputing against matter of fact, the *Observer* still insists upon the original contract which the first Saxon kings made when they were created by the people.

R. But it is not fact, till he has produced that original contract: which it is plain he has not yet done; for the Saxons, when they came over hither, were heathens, and for a good while after. And it is evident that they were papists when what the *Observer*, N. 50. quotes out of Lambard's Saxon laws was transacted; for they built upon the authority of the pope, and his universal supremacy, as before is shewed. Therefore these could not be the first Saxon kings, upon whom the *Observer*, N. 54. does charge it. This could not be the time when these kings were first created by the people, as the *Observer* words it. So that he must go somewhere higher than Lambard to find out this original contract.

5. Besides, what he refers to are no laws, either of the confessor, or of the conqueror, but some commentaries or common-places upon our ancient laws, compiled by one who had no great skill in Saxon, or the elder customs of his country. But for a just censure of these laws, I refer the reader to the *Dissertatio Epistolaris* of Dr. Hicks in the body of *Thesaur. Ling. Septentr.* for I have not time to stay upon it here, because, as I have shewed, it signifies nothing what these laws were; for our dispute is about our present laws, and which are of force now in England.

6. C. Let me only ask a question at the *Observer*, how he likes the beginning of that quotation he gives us, N. 50. out of Lambard, where the king is stil'd the vicar or lieutenant of the King of kings? How then is he servant of the people, and accountable to them? As the *Observer* and whigs would have him.

7. R. And Lambard says, that the king is appointed (but he does not say by the people, it follows more easily from his words) by the King of kings, whose lieutenant he

he is; for who can appoint a *lieutenant* for God, but God himself? The *pope* claims this *authority* as being constituted by *Christ* his *supreme vicar* or *lieutenant* over all these *deputy lieutenants*. And he quotes for it such *texts* as these: *I will give thee the keys — Feed my sheep, &c.* which are far enough from the purpose. But what *text* has the *people* for their assuming this *authority*? They must be content with *Curse ye Meroz — Bind their kings in chains — Such honour have all his saints.*

C. This is only for the *saints*. But our *rebels* are all *saints*! For do not they *rebel* for *religion*?

8. But, *master*, as to the end for which the *king* is appointed, *Lambard* here says, as the *Observer* quotes him, that it is to govern the *people* of the *Lord*. Then surely they do not govern him. That would be *fool-play* indeed! I *king* over you, and you the *king* over me!

9. R. But the great point is a coming, *That above all he* (the *king*) *should revere his* (God's) *holy church*, and defend it from *injurious persons*; & *maleficos ab ea evellat*: which the *Observer* translates only, and ill men take off, and utterly destroy. But he has left out the words *ab ea*, which point out what *wickedness* is here meant; that is, those who do hurt to the *church*, and that the *king* should utterly destroy such, *ab ea*, from that *church*. *Quod nisi fecerit* (says *Lambard*) *which unless he does*; *nec nomen regis in eo constabit*: which is no more than that he *deserves not the name of a king*, or it does not appear in him; which the *Observer* renders, *the name of king he shall not have or retain*. But *Lambard* says not that the *people* may *depose* him for this; nor *pope John* neither, who says he *loses the name of king*. And so may be said of a *cruel* or *tyrant husband* or *father*, that he *loses the name of father*; that is, does not *deserve* it; but yet he ceases not to be a *father*, and he may mend.

Wednesday, September 15, 1708. No. 356.

1. The *Observer* has made a *rod* for himself, which would *scourge* him and all the *whigs* to death.
2. He writes direct *treason* against the *queen*, and *spirits* up the *people* to *rebellion*.
3. A *prodigy* in this *nation*, of *preaching* and *printing* so publicly for *coercion* upon the *government*!
4. The *queen* threatened with the example of her royal *grand-father*, and the *laws* made the chief instrument of his *ruin*! Who cut off his *head*?
5. How the *Observer* comes to call *Oliver* an *usurper*. The reason of the *rage* of the *whigs* against the *church*.
6. He *falsely* and most *villainously* charges king *Char. I.* with *invading* the *constitution* of *parliament* by *military* *force*. It was the *parliament* began the *war*.
7. He *falsely* *ascribes* the *revolution* with *asserting* the *coercive* power of *parliaments* over *tyrants*.

1. *Conn.* **B**Y the *Observer*'s doctrine, *master*, he would *hang* himself, and a many more! even all the *whigs* and *dissenters*, who do not *revere* the *church*, but *plot* against her, *wilify* and *defame* her; nay, by *Lambard* and his *Saxon* *laws*, that king (or *queen*) who should *spare* any of them, deserves not the name of a *king*, and (as the *Observer* understands these *laws*) ought to be *deposed*.

*R.* You see what a *rod* the *Observer* has bound up finely to *whip* himself, but he wants some body to lay it on—

2. *C.* That's a pity! *master*, but you have done pretty well, I believe by this time you have made him weary of his *Saxon* *laws*, and you have ruined all his *defences* for *coercion*; nay, you have brought him in for *treason* too; for if to say and *print* it, that every free-born *Englishman* has power to pull the *queen*'s crown off her head be not *treason*, then there can be none in *words* or *writing*.

ing. And the *Observer* does all he can to make the people of England fond of this power he puts in them, which is all the mischief he can do, and it is a great deal, it makes the people perfect tinder for rebellion. There is no government can be so administered but some will be disoblighd, and there will be parties and designs; and these principles of the whigs gives every discontented party full power and authority to raise rebellion whenever they can; all obligations as to conscience are taken quite out of the way!

3. R. I believe there is not a nation upon the face of the earth (except this) where the doctrine of coercion upon the government is publicly preached in the pulpits, and justified in print among all the people!

C. And which is more strange, master, you that write against coercion do it at your peril! and the government is hunted upon you for this by the coercion-men! who think they merit from the government by it! and plead for themselves, that it makes against the government, to free the government from the coercion of their subjects! and that none ought to be trusted or employed by the queen whose principles do not put her life and crown at the mercy of every boor in Britain, and that such are her best subjects! but that whosoever would save her from coercion is her enemy, would destroy her, and ought not to be suffered to come near her! and they brand these with the name of tories, high-church, Jacobites, and even papists.

4. R. These are paradoxes time must discover, and what will be the end of these things! But it looks the more threatening how the *Observer* applies it, and compares it with the fate of the queen's royal grand-father, whose ruin he charges upon those that fought for him, and opposed the principle of coercion, which he labours to shew in his of the 14. and 31. of July last, Num. 43. and 48.

C. This is paradox again! and threatening with a vengeance to the queen, what will become of her, if she take not the same method her grand-father did to ruin him-

himself, that is, to trust them with the *power* who are for the *deposing-doctrine*, and the *principle of coercion*! and then, though they should cut off her head (which God avert) it would be the *tories* and *high-church* brought her to her ruin! [they have told us already she has a fine *white neck*! (see N. 39.) they are *smacking their lips* beforehand!] and you, *master*, would come in as an *accomplice* for speaking against *coercion*! just as arch-bishop *Laud* and the other loyal *divines* of the *church of England* are brought in by the *Observer* for preaching the same *doctrine*! but you have told us it is no other than what our *laws* do teach us. And may not the *clergy* speak in defence of the *laws* of the *land*, when they are agreeable and consonant to the *law of God*? And had not the *king* more reason to trust to the *laws* of the *land* than to any *sermon* preached before him? So that the *laws* come in (more than the *clergy*) as contributing to the *ruin* of that gracious *prince*! and thus it is the *law* makes *sin*! for where there is no *law*, there is no *transgression*.

But, *master*, whoever contributed to his ruin, the *Observer* will not say it was the *cavaliers* cut off his head. So that his ruin (come how it will) was in being put into those hands who justified the *principle of coercion*, and never failed to *practise* it, when it was in their power, and we may safely say never will; for would you not have men act according to their *principles*?

5. R. But the *Observer*, N. 48. says, that *Oliver* the *usurper*——

C. Hold, *master*, does he call *Oliver* an *usurper*? how will this stand with his *principle of power* in the *people*? for was it not the *people* set up *Oliver*? and a good many *people* too, else he had never conquered the *king*. And was not the *king* tried in the name and by the *authority* of all the good *people* of *England*? And does the *Observer* think all this was wrong?

R. No, *countryman*, he approves it all at his heart, and would do it again, and so would all his *party* if they could. It is the *tories* and *high-church* stand in their

their way, which makes them *mad* against them, out of all *patience*! and his calling *Oliver* an *usurper* is but the copy of his *countenance*, and to comply with the *iniquity* (as he thinks) of the times.

6. But now I'll go on to shew how he makes *Oliver* copy after king *Char. I.* as he says, and that was by *invading the constitution of parliament with a military force*, as you will find it in the conclusion of that *Observer*.

C. O *villain*! here he sticks his venom'd dart in the heart of the king! worse than the ax that cut off his head! But he should first have answered the king himself, who in his *speech* upon the scaffold appealed to the *dates* of the *commissions* of his and the *parliaments*, which of them began the war.

7. R. But he says (*ibid.*) *That the convention and following parliaments (since the revolution) have re-asserted the coercive power of parliaments over tyrants.*

C. That is *news* indeed! I'm sure you told me otherwise, that there is no *act* of parliament since the revolution that asserts the *coercive* power of *parliaments* over kings.

R. No, but he says over *tyrants*, and he can produce no such *act* neither since the revolution. It is an easy matter to call any king a tyrant, and who shall be judge? The revolution was guilty of no such *blunders* as these!

---

Saturday, September 18, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 357.

---

1. All *Oliviers* the same. *Coercion* is only *scaffolding*.
2. The *revolution* avoided *coercion*, and did not *establis* it. The *Observer* would *hang* himself if he were a *king*. No *parliament* will *establis* *coercion*.
3. The *philosopher's stone* the *whigs* would find out in *government*.
4. It is beyond the extremest *folly*, it is a *judicial insatuation*; but more in us than in any other people.
5. The deep *tincture* of *rebellion*. It is rarely *repented* of.
6. The good the *Rehearsals* have done, by way of *provocation* to the *whigs* to *answer*, and not *scold*.
7. The *Rehearsal* and the *Observer* write in *concert* by *chance*.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* is very angry with his beloved *Oliver*, who fought for *coercion* and the *power* of *parliaments* over *kings*, that when he got the *power* into his own hands, he would not assert the *coercive* power of *parliaments* over *himself*, and so cheated all those that fought for him!

R. Poor *fools*! and I can tell them, if they had another and another *Oliver*, they would all be the same. Do they think an *Oliver* would *fight* and *conquer* to put himself under the *coercion* of those he *commands*!

The plea of *coercion* over *kings* is only used as *scaffolding*, whereby *rebels* climb up to the *supreme power*. But you know when the *house* is built the *scaffolding* is taken away.

2. C. And the *Observer* and his friends are as much disturbed that they cannot find *coercion* in the *revolution*! they expected it—But the *convention* took another way, the way of *abdication*, and that on purpose to avoid the *illegal* method of *coercion*; yet the *whigs* will still have it to be *coercion*, because they so intended it. They will

will not believe the *convention*, but battle it too! they have not got their ends in this *revolution*; and I can tell them they never will. They quarrelled with *Oliver* their *deliverer*! and let them go through all the *rebellions* and *usurpations* that ever were in *England*, or any where else, and they will never find, that any who had got into the *throne* (by whatever means) would allow of *coercion* against it. There is not a *whig* in *Britain* would do it; no, not the *Observer* himself, I'll answer for him! If he were a *king*, he would put it in nobody's power to *dethrone* him; he would then take your side of the question, *master*, and argue, as you do, against *coercion*; he would then see all the mischievous consequences that attend it! he would then *hang* such an *Observer* as himself is, who should justify *coercion*!

Nay, I'll tell him more, he will never get a *parliament* to establish *coercion* over the *king*, because that would bring *coercion* over themselves; for the power of the *people* extends to both, and more to the *parliament*; for it is certain they are *chosen* by the *people*. And we have seen them *legioned* in the name of the *people*, and threatened to be pulled in pieces by them!

3. R. And now, *countryman*, what is it these *whigs* are striving for! a *king* under *coercion*! such a thing, that if all the *whigs* in *Britain* were made *kings* after one another, they could never find! And if every one of the *parliament* was as rank a *whig* as the *Observer*, they would be as far from allowing *coercion* over themselves as any. Did they do it in 1648? Or do you think they ever will do it? And yet the *nation* must be set on fire, which must not be suffered to go out day nor night to find out this *philosophers stone*! We must spend all we have to grasp this *shadow*! It will turn every thing it touches into *gold*, no doubt, when we can find it, that is, a *government* which may do us all the good it can, but in whose power it shall not be to do us any hurt!

C. That is, wherein there can be no mistakes, no *mal-administration*; which is impossible, while *government* is

in the hands of *men*! And to cure these *mistakes* by *coercion* is ten times worse; it is *hell* broke loose, for the *coercion* must go round to whoever has the *government*, and there can be no *end*! it makes every man *judge* over the *government*, and every *Tom, Dick, or Will*, may use *coercion* over the *government*, and over *one another*, whenever they so think fit! This is very *confusion* and *Babel*!

4. R. This case is so *plain*, so *obvious* to any one that can but *think*, that there is not in *nature* such another instance of *stupidity*, of want of common *sense* and *reason*, as in those who cannot *understand* it! But it proceeds from another cause. It can be accounted for no otherwise than as a *blindness* which is judicial, an *infatuation* sent upon that *people* whom *God* has determined to *destroy*. It *destroys* them *inevitably*, even by a *natural* consequence; and most *terribly*, in making them *destroy* one another. It has never failed to do so in any *country* where the *principle* of *coercion* has prevailed. But it is an *astonishment* and a *judgment* even beyond this, that while we were yet *bleeding*, and the *marks* of *ruin* every where before our eyes, of *places* burnt, and *families* destroyed, by this *principle* of *coercion*; that in the same *age*, and while we can yet remember all this, we should fall so soon again into the *pit*, whence we had but just got out! and this with our *eyes* open, and the same *pit* still open before us! That we should be pleased with this *doctrine* of *coercion*, now sounding again from *press* and *pulpit*! This is a *judgment* which *God* has not sent upon any other *nation* round about us. People use to be aware of what has *hurt* them, for some time at least. They say a burnt *child* will dread the *fire*; but so much *consideration* is not left with us! we are grown *insensible* and *obstinate*, like the *drunkard* described *Prov. xxiii. 35*. They have stricken me, and I was not sick; they have beaten me, and I felt it not. When shall I awake? I will seek it yet again. We are hardly awakened out of our late *rebellion*; and we seek it yet again! we are drunk with *rebellion*! nothing will cure us! Why should ye be  
stricken

*stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more. See how men in such a desperate state are described Isai. viii. 20. And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king, and their God, and look upward. And by St. John thus, Rev. xvi. 9. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, who had power over their plagues, and they repented not to give him glory.*

5. I have taken notice before, that there is no *sin* which hardens the heart, and blinds the eyes like *rebellion*; and of which fewer men repent. See the hardened state of rebels under the head *rebellion*; and the progress of this my dispute with the *whigs* shews it to a demonstration! They are confuted and confounded, that they have nothing to say — yet they will not repent! No, it is hid from their eyes!

6. C. But I hope it will open the eyes of others, as it has mine. Grudge not the pains you have taken, *master*, it has done good; I know it has; I meet with it every where; and if you went to *coffee-houses*, as I do, you would hear it too; you would see young men baffle old *whigs*, and keep their noses close to the grind-stone of the *Rehearsals*; and they have now no remedy left, but not to go to those *coffee-houses* where the *Rehearsals* are taken in, and to threaten those *coffee-houses* they frequent, that they will quit the house if they take in the *Rehearsals*. This may offend your modesty; but I do it to bully these sparks a little, and provoke them (if possible) to answer your arguments; and not to rail and scold at you as they do, which I tell them does you no harm, but makes them more ridiculous.

7. But some think you write in concert with the *Observer*, and that he is to put silly objections on purpose for you to expose, and to leave blots for you to hit; and they are the rather of this opinion, because it so happens sometimes, that you answer what he says the same day that his comes out: so that either you must know beforehand what he writes, or else have an odd guess with you what he will be upon next. Thus yours of the 14

*July last is a direct answer to his of the same date; wherein he says, That the presbyterians in Scotland took arms to rescue the king. And yours shews, that the presbyterians in Scotland did oppose and protest against the raising an army to rescue the king, declared it an unlawful engagement, and put those under censure who were concerned in it. To which the Observer has not answered one word since, for he knows it to be plain fact, and all the nation knows it. Was not this giving you a blot to hit, and then leaving his cause in the lurch? I tell you it looks as if it were concerted.*

---

Wednesday, September 22, 1708. N<sup>o</sup>. 358.

---

More instances of concert with the *Observer*.

1. That what was called a *parliament* in 48 was no *parliament*.
2. Yet it asserted it self higher, and did more mischief than any *parliament* ever did before. A *relapse* worse than the *disease*.
3. The *Observer* of 10 *July* last plays to the *Rehearsal's* hand, in quoting *Deut. xvii.* and *1 Sam. viii.*
4. In his *blunder*, that the *people* had the *choice* of the *king*, when *God* had the *naming* of the *person*!
5. In making a *prophecy* the *rule* of *government*! and the *prophecy* of a *sin* to *sanctify* the *sin*!
6. In pitching upon *Solomon* for his instance of a *tyrant*!
7. In making his glorious *reign* the *manner* of a *king* described *1 Sam. viii.* and that he ought to have been *deposed*!
8. He makes the *deposition* of the late king *James* a parallel case to this; and puts the *revolution* upon the same foot as the *revolt* of the *ten tribes*, which is called a *rebellion*, *1 Kin. xii. 19.*

Coun. SINCE the instance I gave last time, *master*, of the *Observer* writing in concert with you, the town has got it by the end, and now they find many

many more passages which confirm them in that opinion.

1. For example, says one, the *Observer* of the 31 July last, N. 48. quotes the *statute* 12 Car. II. c. 30. speaking of those whom it calls *rebellious miscreants*, the disgrace of *England*, and of the *protestant religion*, who set up the *principle of coercion* against king *Char. I.* says of them, *That they did seek to shelter themselves under the name and authority of a parliament.*

Now what was this for (said the *Remarker*) but to lead the *Rehearsal* (or any body else) to infer, that we must not take every thing for a *parliament* that calls it self so? but we must examine whether it be legally constituted, according to the known *laws* of the land; for otherwise (as that *statute* says) a company of *rebels* or *miscreants* may get together, and call themselves a *parliament*!

2. R. And yet that *parliament* (as they called themselves) in 1648, cut off the *king's* head for denying their *authority*; and *harassed* and *destroyed* many *thousands* for the same reason. No *parliament* before them ever asserted their *authority* half so high as they did, or did half so much *mischief*! What's to come we know not, but I hope we shall never see the like again; never see a *parliament* ride *triumphant* over the *king*, and he become *subject* unto his *subjects*! for if *God* should so suffer it for our *sins*, we may expect to undergo the same or greater *miseries* than we felt even in 1648, and all the *consequences* of it! for after that there were but 12 years to the happy *restoration*. We find in the book of *Judges* that the *captivity* of the *people* was still longer and longer, as they repeated their *sin*, and the *second* *provocation* was punished more than the *first*.

3. C. A very useful *observation*; I wish we may think of it. But, *master*, let me go on and tell you more of the concert that is supposed betwixt the *Rehearsal* and the *Observer*; they think that the *Observer* of 10th July last, Num. 42. was thus wrote; and thus they make the *Rehearsal* say to him, Good Mr. *Observer*, you know that among those *texts of scripture*, relating to govern-

*July last is a direct answer to his of the same date; wherein he says, That the presbyterians in Scotland took arms to rescue the king. And yours shews, that the presbyterians in Scotland did oppose and protest against the raising an army to rescue the king, declared it an unlawful engagement, and put those under censure who were concerned in it. To which the Observer has not answered one word since, for he knows it to be plain fact, and all the nation knows it. Was not this giving you a blot to bit, and then leaving his cause in the lurch? I tell you it looks as if it were concerted.*

---

Wednesday, September 22, 1708. No. 358.

---

More instances of concert with the *Observer*.

1. That what was called a *parliament* in 48 was no *parliament*.
2. Yet it asserted it self higher, and did more mischief than any *parliament* ever did before. A *relapse* worse than the *disease*.
3. The *Observer* of 10 *July* last plays to the *Rehearsal's* hand, in quoting *Deut. xvii.* and *1 Sam. viii.*
4. In his *blunder*, that the *people* had the *choice* of the *king*, when *God* had the *naming* of the *person*!
5. In making a *prophecy* the *rule* of *government*! and the *prophecy* of a *sin* to *sanctify* the *sin*!
6. In pitching upon *Solomon* for his instance of a *tyrant*!
7. In making his *glorious reign* the *manner* of a *king* described *1 Sam. viii.* and that he ought to have been *deposed*!
8. He makes the *deposition* of the late king *James* a parallel case to this; and puts the *revolution* upon the same foot as the *revolt* of the *ten tribes*, which is called a *rebellion*, *1 Kin. xii. 19.*

Coun. SINCE the instance I gave last time, *master*, of the *Observer* writing in concert with you, the town has got it by the end, and now they find many

many more passages which confirm them in that opinion.

1. For example, says one, the *Observer* of the 31 *July* last, N. 48. quotes the *statute* 12 *Car. II. c. 30.* speaking of those whom it calls *rebellious miscreants*, the disgrace of *England*, and of the *protestant religion*, who set up the *principle of coercion* against king *Char. I.* says of them, *That they did seek to shelter themselves under the name and authority of a parliament.*

Now what was this for (said the *Remarker*) but to lead the *Rehearsal* (or any body else) to infer, that we must not take every thing for a *parliament* that calls it self so? but we must examine whether it be legally constituted, according to the known *laws* of the land; for otherwise (as that *statute* says) a company of *rebels or miscreants* may get together, and call themselves a *parliament*!

2. *R.* And yet that *parliament* (as they called themselves) in 1648, cut off the *king's* head for denying their *authority*; and *harassed* and *destroyed* many *thousands* for the same reason. No *parliament* before them ever asserted their *authority* half so high as they did, or did half so much *mischief*! What's to come we know not, but I hope we shall never see the *like* again; never see a *parliament* ride *triumphant* over the *king*, and he become *subject* unto his *subjects*! for if *God* should so suffer it for our *sins*, we may expect to undergo the same or greater *miseries* than we felt even in 1648, and all the *consequences* of it! for after that there were but 12 years to the happy *restoration*. We find in the book of *Judges* that the *captivity* of the *people* was still *longer* and *longer*, as they repeated their *sin*, and the *second provocation* was *punished* more than the *first*.

3. *C.* A very useful *observation*; I wish we may think of it. But, *master*, let me go on and tell you more of the *concert* that is supposed betwixt the *Rehearsal* and the *Observer*; they think that the *Observer* of 10th *July* last, *Num. 42.* was thus wrote; and thus they make the *Rehearsal* say to him, Good Mr. *Observer*, you know that among those *texts of scripture*, relating to govern-

ment, which I have explained, there are none upon which the *whigs* lay more stress, or quote so often as these of *Deut. xvii. 14.* &c. and *1 Sam. viii.* about the people *choosing a king*. \*Now both these I have particularly considered N. 75. 76. but it may be forgot, and it would be a shame for me to repeat it over again; therefore do you quote these *texts* against me for the right of the people to *choose their king*, and give your paper this title, *Arguments to prove against the Rehearsal, that God gave power to the people to choose and limit their kings, to judge if they broke their original contract, and to renounce their allegiance, if they would not govern accordingly; which justifies the late happy revolution.* And in yours of the 11th instant, N. 355. I refer to these *texts* again, and brag exceedingly. But lest the people should not know that these *texts* are answered already, lead them into it by saying thus of me at the conclusion of your *Observer*, N. 42. He is so very modest as to refer us to his former papers, to save him the trouble of repeating. This will make them enquire and find it out.

4. Then be sure you commit a good many blunders, lest the people should be deceived by you and think you are in earnest! Say at the end of p. 1. and beginning of p. 2. of N. 42. (that it may be in both) *That though God named the person, he did not deprive the people of their right of choosing and making him (Saul) king.* And repeat this again p. 2. col. 2. that it may not appear to be said by chance, or that it was any mistake, and say, *They were allowed a choice, where God himself had the naming of the person.* This will make every body laugh, and cry out, what choice had the people if God had the naming of the person? Could they choose any other than whom God named? Or will the *Observer* go the length of the rights that God did name, by an authority derived from the people?

5. Then, Sir, again, you know my answer to that of *Deut. xvii.* was, that it was a prophecy but no allowance of that great sin the *Israelites* should commit in asking a king; which was fulfilled in what is told *1 Sam. viii.*

viii. Do you therefore call it a *prophecy*, and say, p. 2. col. 1. *This is only a prophecy*. But then, to please the whigs, say a few lines after, *That Deut. xvii. was the standing rule of government*. This lays them open to the folly of making a *prophecy* the rule of government; and that government upon the choice of the people to be the best, which is *prophefied* of as the worst and most wicked in the world! for no body can avoid asking this question, Whether their desiring a king was not a great sin? And then whether the *prophecy* of it so long before did make it just and lawful? It is *prophefied* likewise, that they should *chuse* strange Gods. Did this make it lawful? And was not their *rejecting* God from being their king (which was their sin) near a-kin to their rejecting him from being their God?

6. Then just after this (to make the plea the *rebelli*ng for *tyranny* most *ridiculous*) *chuse* Solomon for your instance, and make him a great tyrant, who promoted trade the most of any king in Israel, and made silver as plenty as stones in Jerusalem. And *chuse* for your instances of *tyranny* the method he took in providing for so great numbers of his people, and finding employments for them; 40,000 stalls for his chariots, and 12,000 for horsemen, and by employing 70,000 to bear burdens, and 80,000 to hew in the mountains, over whom there were 3300 rulers. And by making the people men of war, captains, and rulers of his chariots, and horsemen. Here was many a good place to be had; and those multitudes of poor among us who complain and go a begging for want of employment, had here been provided for, and there had been no poor-rates to be paid. O cruel *tyranny* and *oppression*!

7. Then make all this the manner of a king described 1 Sam. viii. with which the whigs used to *bugbear* the people, and say, In a word Solomon made them his servants, as Samuel foretold would be the manner of the king; and add, which was directly contrary to the original contract. This makes it full nonsense! It is true that God commands the king to do so and so, but there is not a scrap of

any *contract* made with him by the *people*, or of any *authority* given them to *coerce* him, if he transgressed the commands of *God*.

Then say, that *Solomon* should have been *deposed* for his *tyranny* by the *people*, if he would have let them—but they *deposed* his *son*, who was not so *wise* as he; and that not for any fault of his own, but for the *tyranny* above-said of his *father*!

8. And now, my dear *Observer*, what if you should make an application, and close *col. 1.* of your p. 2. with something like *treason*, and say, *Upon this they renounced their allegiance, as we did ours to the late king James?* But I would advise you to have a care! for by this you put the *revolution* upon the same foot with the *revolt* called a *rebellion* of the *ten tribes*, for the *tyranny* of the reign of *Solomon*!

R. You have made a fine speech for me to the *Observer*. But I'll *concert* no more with him, if he talks at this rate.

Saturday, September 25, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 359.

1. The *Observer* makes the *revolution* to be a *rebellion*.
2. There was a *prophecy* for *Absalom* as well as for *Jeroboam*. *David* did not think a *prophecy* sufficient to justify a *rebellion*.
3. The *ten tribes* were in the *rebellion* of *Absalom*. The *two tribes* restored king *David*.
4. Objection that the *ten tribes* did likewise assist in the *restoration*.
5. The *ten tribes* were called *Israel*, the *two tribes* were called *Judah*, first in this *rebellion*.
6. The *Judahites* led the way, the *Israelites* followed in this *restoration*.
7. The *ten tribes* revolted again under *Sheba*.
8. Their *rebellion* under *Jeroboam* was the same, and in the same words. And the *Observer* makes the *revolution* the same.
9. The danger of *relapsing* in *rebellion*. Beware of the *third time*.

1. Coun. **Y**OU quoted the *Observer* in your last, saying, *Upon this they* (the *ten tribes*) *renounced their allegiance*, as we did ours to the late king *James*. Now if this *revolt* of the *ten tribes* was a *rebellion*, then the *Observer* is finely caught in his own *snare*, and instead of justifying the *revolution*, he has here made it a downright *rebellion*!

2. R. If the *revolt* of the *ten tribes* under *Jeroboam* was no *rebellion*, neither was the *revolt* of *Absalom* or *Sheba* against king *David*. All that's to be said for *Jeroboam* is the *prophecy* of *Abijah* to him, that God would give him *ten tribes*. See what I have said to this N. 77. and wherein *prophecies* are no *warrant* or *justification* of what is *prophefied* of as in the case of *Hazael*, 2 *Kings* viii. 12, 13. But will a *prophecy* justify *Jeroboam*? So it will *Absalom*! for thus it was *prophefied* of him, 2 *Sam*

xii. 11. *Thus saith the Lord (to David) Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house; and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this sun. And again, The sword shall not depart from thine house. Did this justify the rebellion of Absalom against his father, or his monstrous incest in going up to his father's bed?*

David had the temptation of a prophecy too, when he found Saul in the cave, 1 Sam. xxiv. 4. *And the men of David said unto him, Behold the day of which the Lord said unto thee, Behold, I will deliver thine enemy into thine hand, that thou may'st do to him as it shall seem good unto thee. But David did not think a prophecy sufficient warrant for a rebellion, or to lift up his hand against his master, the Lord's anointed; but said, Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked, therefore, Mine hand shall not be upon him.*

3. But I observe another thing to you, countryman, these ten tribes were used to rebellion; their revolt under Jeroboam was not the first time; they were the chief in the rebellion of Absalom. But the loyalty remained with Judah the far less part of the kingdom; and the men of Judah were the chief instruments in the restoration of king David; which made the ten tribes grumble, and they said, *We have ten parts in the king—Why then did ye (men of Judah) despise us, that our advice should not be first had in bringing back our king?* 2 Sam. xix. 43. *And all the men of Judah answered the men of Israel, Because the king is near of kin to us (for David was of the tribe of Judah) wherefore then be ye angry at this matter? Have we eaten at all of the king's cost? Or hath he given us any gift? It was nothing but pure loyalty that moved them; for they knew that when the king was restored, the ten tribes, because of their number and their riches, would have a greater share in him. And yet, The words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the words of the men of Israel.*

4. C. But, master, it would seem to me that the men of Israel were as forward as the men of Judah; for it is said

said, ver. 9. *And all the people were at strife throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, The king saved us out of the hand of our enemies, and he delivered us out of the hand of the Philistines, and now he is fled out of the land for Absalom. And Absalom, whom we anointed over us, is dead in battle: Now therefore why speak ye not a word of bringing the king back? Were not the men of Israel then as forward as the men of Judah?*

5. *R. Israel* was the name for the whole nation, where it was not used in contradistinction to *Judah*, as including likewise the tribe of *Benjamin*, of which this was the first time. This rebellion of *Absalom* was the occasion which made this distinction, the loyal *Judahites* including the *Benjamites*, adhering to *David*, and the *Israelites* generally running after *Absalom*. Yet (so proud are riches and numbers) the *Israelites*, as they were the chief in the rebellion, so they would have the glory of the restoration too! and they quarrelled with *Judah* (that little part of the nation in comparison of them) for stealing the king home (as they word it ver. 41.) and bringing him over the river *Jordan*, before the *Israelites* knew of it. But the priests were loyal, and the king employed them to *Judah*, saying, *Ye are my brethren, ye are my bones and my flesh*———*And he bowed the heart of all the men of Judah, even as the heart of one man, so that they sent this word unto the king, Return thou and all thy servants. So the king returned*———*And Judah came to meet the king, and to conduct him over Jordan.*

6. But to do the *Israelites* right, they were not generally averse to the restoration, for by this time (it was but one campaign) they were sufficiently weary with their rebellion, they saw the miseries it had brought upon them, and their deliverer being dead, there was nothing but confusion before them, except in bringing back the king. And there were parties and discontents got among them, and for the divisions of *Reuben* there were great searchings of heart. Yet they went further than, *why speak ye not a word?* Every one would put it off from himself; they were too rich to venture. But the men of *Judah* were

*fiercer and braver* ; they led the way, and the *Israelites* followed ; and then they were vexed they had not led the way themselves : and they said, that their *advice* should have been first *asked*, as *having ten parts in the king*, that is, were *ten* of the twelve tribes. *Benjamin* now joining with *Judah* ; for at first *David* was king of *Judah* only, and the *Benjamites* were then with the *Israelites*. But after he was king of *Israel*, the *Benjamites* were always *loyal*, and joined with *Judah*, which made the *two tribes*.

7. Now, countryman, I go on with you. These same *ten tribes* revolted again from *David* under *Sheba* the son of *Bichri*, who is called a man of *Belial*, 2 Sam. xx. 1. *Absalom* was the king's son, and a person of wonderful beauty and address ; he first stole the hearts of the *ten tribes* from *David* his father. But as these accomplishments may serve first to debauch one, who after turns a common prostitute : So these *ten tribes* having cracked their virtue in their first rebellion, and their *Absalom* being gone, they were content (without all shame) to take up with a nasty *Sheba*, who had *Belial* in him ! So every man of *Israel* went up from after *David*, and followed *Sheba* the son of *Bichri* : But the men of *Judah* cleave unto their king. And what did these *Israelites* say for this ! We have no part in *David*, neither have we inheritance in the son of *Jesse* : Every man to his tents, O *Israel*. Now see what they cried in their next rebellion under *Jeroboam*, 1 Kin. xii. 16. What portion have we in *David* ? Neither have we inheritance in the son of *Jesse* : To your tents, O *Israel* : Now see to thine own house, *David*—So *Israel* rebelled against the house of *David* unto this day.

8. C. I can see no difference in these rebellions ! Here they say the same words under *Jeroboam* as they had done before under *Sheba*. They had learned their lesson, and they but now repeat what they had done before. And here the revolt of *Jeroboam* is plainly called a rebellion, which is more than is said of *Sheba*, though no doubt it was the same. But how can any who owns the revolt of *Absalom* and *Sheba* to have been rebellions, deny

deny this of *Jeroboam* to be so too? There is no *defence* for it; no case can be more *plain*.

And if the *Observer* will not plead his *ignorance* for an *excuse*, then what a fine *character* has he here given of the *revolution*, to say, that we *renounced* our *allegiance* to the late king *James*, as *Absalom* and *Sheba*, and *Jeroboam* did to king *David* and his *house*?

9. R. Let me further observe to you, *countryman*, that these *ten tribes* recovered themselves from their *rebellion* under *Absalom*, and under *Sheba*, but never from that under *Jeroboam*. That was their third *fall* into *rebellion*, and to make it more *wonderful*, any more *provoking*, it was in the same *age* while many of the same persons were still alive, and could remember all the *three*.

---

Wednesday, Sept. 29, 1708. No. 360.

---

1. The *Observer* discovers his utter ignorance in the institutions of religion.
2. To overcharge the *papists* is the greatest service can be done them.
3. The *Observer* denies the holy sacrament in the church of Rome to be the body of *Christ* in any sense at all. And (with the *Rights*) calls consecration a conjuration.
4. By the same argument there is no baptism or ordination in the church of Rome, or of England, or among the dissenters, who have no consecration, and their behaviour at the sacrament is accordingly!
5. The *Observer's* argument, that the *papists* make an idol of the sacrament, makes it not cease to be a sacrament, or takes away the right use of it; nor will justify the *presbyterians* who burnt it by the hands of the hangman.
6. His objections as to the holy sacrament being a sacrifice, answered before.
7. His repeating of slanders already confuted.
8. Particularly as to the persecution in Scotland.
9. As to the murder of the earl of *Essex*.
10. His several poisonings put upon the high-fliers.

*Coun.* **P**RAY, master, do not forget to say something to what the *Observer* of the 21st of this month, N. 54. objects concerning the holy sacrament. You promised to do it, and if you should not, it would be construed a yielding to the charge of popery there given in against you.

1. *R.* You were talking of his playing to my hand. But I am sure he serves the cause of popery here to purpose! whether he designed it or not I will not examine.

But

But if what he says were to be taken as the current *sense* of *protestants*, it would turn all of them that have *sense* back again to *popery*, or else they must resolve to quit their *Christianity*! For here he discovers such a total absence of all notion of the *institutions* of *religion*, as throws them all to the ground, and renders them wholly *precarious* and *useless* to us.

2. And this comes from *over-charging*. When out of *spite* to *popery* we charge them *falsly*, and think we can never make them *black* enough. But this is the greatest *service* we can do them; for when these *accusations* are repelled, (which is easily done) then men think, that all the rest of our *objections* against them are of a piece, and proceed from *ignorance* or *malice*. Whereas if we lay upon them those things only wherein they are *erroneous* (and these are enough) we can keep our ground against them, and may probably *convince* them, and many of them have been *convinced* by this method, especially when managed with *temper*, and a tender *concern* for their *souls*.

This is the method of the *church* of *England*, and it has greatly *prevailed*; but the *fury* and *spite* and *madness* of the *dissenters* against them, *railing* and *scolding* and *calling* them *ill names*, without *learning*, or any *moderation*, provokes their *contempt*, and *nauseates* them at the very name of *protestant*.

3. This *Observer* says, *I deny the popish consecrated wafer to be our Saviour's body in any sense at all.*

We justly deny it in the *sense* of *transubstantiation*, which bishop *Cofins* has unanswerably confuted in his learned *History of Transubstantiation*. But to deny it in any *sense* at all, is in flat opposition to the words of institution, *This is my body*.

C. This is so very gross, that he ought to back it with some extraordinary reason. Pray, what *reason* does he give for this so seemingly *extravagant* an *assertion*?

R. He says, *Because it is not consecrated according to our Saviour's institution, nor to that end for which he appointed it; nor is their pretended sacrament celebrated according*

according to the practice and precept of Christ and his apostles. No man can doubt of this, who has ever seen mass, or looked into the canon of it, which is more like rules for conjuration, than consecration.

C. This is the language of the Rights, which calls our consecrations too, conjurations. You see it goes round, and stops not at popery!

R. We see whose disciple the Observer is, and whose words he repeats!

4. But what are all these out-cries for! It is purely for the ceremonies used in the church of Rome in their consecrations. And we have ceremonies too, and so have the dissenters, but very ill-favoured ones! But do ceremonies, whether more or less, whether decent or ugly, invalidate the sacraments? Then there is no baptism neither in the church of Rome, nor (with these men) in the church of England, nor ordination. And from whom then do the presbyterians derive their ordination? They are cutting the bough upon which themselves do stand.

And to avoid the conjuration, they have dropt the consecration of the sacrament; for (as I am informed) he that acts the part of a priest among them, does neither bless nor break the bread; nor gives it to any but to that one who sits next him, and they hand the loaves and the cup to one another, which he never touched or laid his hands upon, nor does he receive himself with them. And while they are thus eating and drinking to one another, he makes an *harangue* to them even whatever he pleases, all *extempore*; for he is tied to no form (that is an abomination!) And whether he will use the words of institution, (*This is my body, &c.*) or not, (though it is only by way of discourse) is left to his own discretion!

Then for the decency of the matter, they all clap down on their tails (for they love familiarity with God!) on each side a long table, servants carrying behind flaggons of wine, to fill the cups when they are out. That a stranger, who knew not what they were doing, would guess, by their appearance, (seeing them drink to one another without any ceremony, and the cups go round) that

that they were at some other than a *religious* exercise! This might give occasion to the book of the *Rights* to blaspheme this holy sacrament with the name of a *grace-cup*.

Especially if he saw the *anabaptists* (as one told me he did near *White-chapel*) celebrating this sacrament in the boiled *legs* of *mutton*, with good *caper-sauce*, and *wine* without scarcity!

But if any ceremony of decency is used, or regard to the *Lord's body*, then to be received, or stress laid upon the words of *institution*, all this is *conjuraton* with the *Observer* and his *sanctify'd ones*! And if you should offer to receive the *body* of our *Lord* upon your *knees* (as you would a *grant* from the *king*) or any otherwise than (as *Jack-fellows* well met) sitting on your *back-side*, this is no less than *popish idolatry*!

But there may be something of *modesty* in their laying aside *consecrations*, who know they have no right to the *priesthood*, whose office it is. And therefore bring down the *cup* of *blessing*, which the *priests* do *bless*, to be little more than *drinking* to the *pious memory* — And then why may not any one begin the *health* as well as another, a *woman* (if appointed by the *people*) as well as a *man*, according to the doctrine of the *Rights*!

5. C. But he says, that the *popish* consecrated *wafers* are idols.

R. That is, because they *worship* the *host*. The *sun* has been *worshipped* too, and then it was an *idol*, as it is to many *beathens* at this day. Does it therefore cease to be the *sun*? And may not we lawfully make use of its *light* and *heat*? Is it no more a *sun* for *Christians*? If the *papists* *worship* the *sacrament*, must we therefore throw it away, and have no more *sacraments*? Is it therefore to be reckoned among *popish* *reliques* and *monuments* to be removed? Nay, to be burnt by the hands of the common *hangman*, as was lately performed by the *presbyterians* in *Scotland*? Which horrid *atchievement* the *Observer* justifies, and has said all this in defence of it!

C. By

C. By their argument we ought to burn the *Bible* too, because the *papists* have added the *Apocrypha* to it. And that is something more than a *ceremony*; but may not I read the *Apocrypha*, (for there are very good instructions in it) because the *papists* make it *canonical*?

6. R. He put objections against the holy *sacrament* being likewise a *sacrifice*, in his of the 7th last month, N. 50. To which I answered the 14th, N. 347. And in his N. 54. of the 21st the same month, he repeats the same *objections* again, without taking any notice of my *answers*, (a method usual with the *party*.) Therefore I refer him thither again; for I love not *repetitions* as he does.

7. C. He does indeed! as you may see in his paper, N. 56. where he runs over a *bad-roll* of the horrid *lies* and *slanders* cast upon the *court* from king *James* all the way down. All of which have been fully *detected* and *disproved*, till no reply could be made; and now he trumps them up, the full of a *page* of them together, all *fresh* and *blooming*, as if not one word had ever been said against them! This is the method of these men, to make every body weary of *answering* them. And so they keep the *field*! for they are never weary of *slander*, nor *ashamed* when they are *detected* in a thousand *lies*! There never was (surely) such a generation of *men*, who have *sold* themselves to *falsehood*, make *lies* their *refuge*, and are *resolved* to stand *proof* against all *conviction*!

8. R. I have answered one head of his *calumny*, concerning the alledged *persecution* in *Scotland* in the reign of king *Charles II.* And that he might not overlook it, I put it in the *index* of these *volumes*, where under the word *Charles* you will find it repeated in four several *Rehearsals* at different times. And to the *proofs* I there brought, he has not *answered* one word; but here now in this *Observer* he sets the *chimes* a going again upon the *persecution* in *Scotland*!

9. Then he would fix the *murder* of the earl of *Essex* upon the *court*; though he cannot but know, that at the beginning of the *revolution* (where all *crimes* possible

fible were heaped upon the unfortunate king) the lords appointed a committee to examine into that matter, who after the strictest scrutiny found it impossible for any to have done it but the earl himself, by viewing the closet where he was found, and other circumstances. Perhaps the *Observer* may think all this was by collusion, and in favour of the late king James at that time of day!

10. Then he runs on to the supposed poisoning of king Charles II. of prince Henry, eldest son to king James I. nay, and of king Edward VI. for he was poisoned too! And the *Observer* is very sure all this was done by the high-fliers! as certain as that they poisoned prince Eugene in a letter half a year ago!

---

Saturday, Oct. 2, 1708.

N<sup>o</sup> 361.

---

1. The importance of the subject makes me stay longer with the *Observer* than I intended.
2. How he has proved the authentickness of St. Edward's laws.
3. And to be the foundation of magna charta. His demonstration from the plotters in behalf of coercion.
4. This turns intirely against him.
5. His appeal from Westminster-hall to the parliament. The parliament cannot act without, far less against the king. Lawyers made umpires of conscience.
6. If the dispute be concerning the parliament, we must go to the law and to lawyers.
7. The lawyers in forty-eight could not quote any law of England for bringing the king to a trial. The law is plain in some cases (particularly as to coercion) without need of consulting any lawyers.
8. The lawyers the best judges, whether St. Edward's laws are laws now with us.

Coun. **T**HIS *Observer* is such a teasing dun, he'll never let you have done with him. He pulls

pulls you by the sleeve, and still bids you *answer him questions*. In his of the *first* of last month, N. 57. he has abundance, ay, and *answers* your *perlous questions* too about *coercion*, and upon my word he *vapours* over you! and mob Ga—a—pe when they read him, and cry *victoria*!

1. R. I thought to have left him, and gone to another in this *Number*; but to *over-oblige* him, and because this subject of *coercion* is of such mighty *importance*, (even as much as the *lives* and *crowns* of all our *kings* and *queens*, and the *peace* and *happinefs* of *Great Britain* are worth) I will, in answer to this *Observer*, endeavour to make this matter so plain, that the meanest capacity in the nation may be able to understand it. And if they will *practise* accordingly, it will save them from cutting one another's *throats*, and all the *miseries* and *destruction* they have brought upon themselves, by following this *principle* of *coercion*. Therefore tell me what this *Observer* says in defence of it, and I will try what *answer* I can give him.

2. C. I will begin with his *Saxon laws*, and those of *St. Edward*, of which you have spoke a great deal already. But here in this *Observer* he says, *I have proved the authentickness of St. Edward's laws*.

R. This is bravely said! But has he produced any other *authentickness* for them than the *authority* of *Lambard*? Which I told him was by no means sufficient to make them *laws* to us. Are the *originals* of these *laws* to be found among the *records* in the *Tower*, (where our *acts of parliament* are kept) that we may have recourse to them, and compare them with *Lambard's* edition, and with what accounts *historians* or *commentators* (such as *Lambard*) give us of them? We may appeal from a *printed act* of parliament to the *original*, in case of false *printing*, have we the like security in *Lambard*?

But I put this matter to a short issue, and that is, whether those *laws* are pleadable in *Westminster-hall*? Or if the *authority* of *Lambard* would be thought sufficient there, to establish these as *laws* to us, and to justify *coercion* against all our *laws* which condemn it? 5. C.

3. C. O, he has several *answers* to that: The *first* is: That St. Edward's laws continue still to be the foundation of our magna charta.

R. But how does he make *that* appear? Are they recited in magna charta, or said to be the foundation of it?

C. He says no more to that point; if they be not, they ought to be! But he says, *secondly*, that it is plain to a demonstration, that the Rehearser's laws against coercion, are far from being pleadable in Westminster-hall in his sense; for not one of the plotters, or their council, did ever so much as alledge in bar of Judgment, that the defendants (he meant the prisoners at the bar) acted by the late king's commission, against whom there lay no coercive power — Or had they made any such plea, they would soon have found the bench to have asserted the coercive power of the parliament over the late king James.

4. R. How does the Observer know that? Now I am of a different opinion; that the bench would have been very loth to assert the coercive power of the parliament over the king; even king William would not have taken that kindly at their hands. They knew the laws better, and the abdication upon which the convention went, on purpose to avoid the coercion.

But hark ye, Mr. Observer, what were these plotters try'd for? Was it not for their asserting of coercion, and endeavouring to put it in practice? And those same laws against coercion which I have quoted I doubt not were made use of against them, or others to the same purpose. How otherwise could they have been condemned?

Nay, by your principles they were to be justified; for they would have acted only what you and all the whigs maintain; that is, the coercive power of the people over both kings and parliaments; for these plotters were some of the people.

C. This has strengthened those laws you have quoted against coercion, when we see these plotters condemned by those laws, are those laws then antiquated, are they  
of

of no more force, even by the *revolution*? All which the *Observer* would have us believe!

5. But, *master*, his *third* and last reason against appealing to *Westminster-hall*, is best of all. Thus says he to his countryman: *But, after all, Roger, Westminster-hall is not a proper place to determine controversies about kings breaking their original contract; and whether they become tyrants by so doing. These things must be determined by those who are joint legislators with our princes, viz. our two houses of parliament.*

R. Joint legislators with our princes — But then I hope not without our princes, far less against them!

How oft have we been sent to lawyers to settle our conscience about revolutions and different claims to the crown? We have been told, that *divines* have nothing to do in this case; but that we must be determined by the learned in the laws, and our constitution. That these know best whether a king has broke his original contract? Or whether so far as to be *deposable* for it? Yet here the *Observer* turns them all out, as being no proper judges in this matter! No, but we must go to the parliament.

6. C. But t'other day he quoted an *act of parliament* to you, 12 Car. 2. c. 30. which speaking of a former parliament, (that is, which was so esteemed at the time) made it no parliament, but a company of rebels and foul miscreants, who sought to shelter themselves under the name and authority of a parliament. Now in this case, where there is a dispute about a legality of a parliament, it would be ridiculous to go to that parliament to know whether they were a parliament or not. For, as you told me before, no parliament that ever was in England (before that time!) did assert their own authority half so high as that rebel-parliament in 1648, (which Baxter called the *parlamentum beatum*) yet they were miscreants, though they took arms, and carried on a war against their lawful king, for the good of the protestant religion! And sure the *Observer* would not have me go to such a parliament as this, to ask them whether they

were

were a *parliament*, and an *honest* and *lawful* one too! And whither then must we go to know this? Even to the *laws*, and to *lawyers*, as knowing these best; and yet I'll warrant there were *lawyers* in those times, who justify'd all that was then done!

7. R. But I told you before, that none of them, no not *Bradshaw* at the mock-trial of the *king*, could produce one *law* or *act* of *parliament* for what they did. They went (with the *Observer*) to old imaginary *laws* of *Saxons*, and *original contracts* in the *clouds*! But when I see the known and received *laws* speak full and express against *coercion*, I need not ask any *lawyer* in the world whether *coercion* be *lawful*? I may as well ask, whether it be *lawful* to *kill*, *steal*, or commit *adultery*?

8. But after all, the *Observer* has quite mistaken the question; for that was not whether the *king* had broken his *original contract*, or were *deposable*? Of which he will not let *Westminster-hall* be judge (nor I neither) but whether such things as *Lambard's Saxon laws* are *laws* with us at this day? And sure *lawyers* should best know what is *law*; and whether such a thing be an *act* of *parliament* or not? For this is the case.

---

 Wednesday, Oct. 6, 1708.
 

---

 No. 362.
 

---

1. The dispute is only how to know an *act of parliament*.
2. The *Observer* yields all the *judges* and *lawyers* in *England* to be on my side.
3. His *dernier resort* of *parliament* makes against him most of all.
4. He grants, that *coercion* over the *king* or the *crown* is *treason*, and *nonsense*.
5. But he says a *tyrant* is no *king*.
6. Then no *king* can be a *tyrant*.
7. What he means by *coercion* over the *crown*. He separates the *authority* of the *king* from his *person*; which is *traiterous*.
8. He is against the *king de facto*, unless he be *de jure* too.
9. He thinks the late *king James* ceased to be *de jure* for the *toleration* he granted to the *dissenters*. The *style* of *king* was given to *king Charles I.* at his *trial*, and on the *scaffold*. What *Lambard* meant by losing the *name* of *king*.
10. By the *Observer's* rule we cannot know who is *king*, or who is *tyrant*.
11. His argument strikes at all *kings*, *good*, *bad*, or *indifferent*.
12. By his assertion there is not a *king* or *queen* now in the world, or ever were.

1. *Coun.* YOU have set the *Observer* right, in the close of your last, *master*, as to the *state* of the *case* betwixt you; which is no more than if I should quote a false *act of parliament* in *Westminster-hall*, and then should deny that all the *judges* and *lawyers* there could tell better than I whether it was an *act of parliament* or not? For which I suppose there is no more

more than going to the *Statute-book* for it. And if I cannot shew it there, or in the *original records*, then it is no *act of parliament*; for all our *acts of parliament* are there. And if the *Observer* cannot shew his *Saxon laws* there, they are no *laws of ours*; and yet *Westminster-hall* must be no judge of this, but only the *parliament*!

2. R. However, he by this has given me all the judges and all the lawyers in England on my side. And if we all cannot hold it out against the *Observer*, he is a man of mettle indeed!

3. But now, that I may demolish him intirely, and not leave him a rag to cover his nakedness, I will go with him to his *dernier resort* the *parliament*. And he will find as few friends there as in *Westminster-hall*; all make against him. Nay, none so bad as this! For I have produced *acts of parliament* not only condemning all coercion, as if then enacted by authority of that present *parliament*, but declaring of former times, that by the *undoubted and fundamental laws* of this kingdom, neither *parliament* nor people ever had, or have, or ought to have, any coercive power over the kings of this realm. And can we suppose, that none of either house of lords or commons had ever heard of *Lambard* and his *Saxon laws*? Yet we see what regard was paid to them! that notwithstanding of all that the *Observer* has pleaded out of them, yet that coercion ever was against the *fundamental laws* of this realm, and that this was *undoubted*.

C. Alas, poor *Observer*! Whither will he go now? His *dernier resort*, as well as *Westminster-hall*, has forsaken him, and cut him down more than all the rest of his evidence.

4. But, master, he seems to give up the cause, and come to your hand intirely; for in the same *Observer* you were last upon of the *first of September* last, N. 57. he says thus to his Roger:

“ He (the Rehearser) talks of a coercive power over kings, and over the crown, which I have told him, as  
VOL. V. L “ plain

"plain as I could, is nonsense, as well as treason, and defended by no body that I know of."

Now what would you have more? He makes it nonsense, as well as treason. He clears both the king and the crown from all coercion.

5. R. You mistake him, countryman. He explains himself afterwards, as he did in several of his *Observations* before, that if a king breaks the laws, he, *ipso facto*, ceases to be a king, and from that moment commences a tyrant! and he is only for deposing tyrants, but not kings.

6. C. But is not a tyrant a king? Do not we say a tyrannical king? Which could not be, if a tyrant were not a king.

7. But he frees the crown too from coercion. By which I do not suppose he means to coerce some of the jewels out of it, as *Blood* did. But to coerce its just power and prerogative; that is, the authority of him who has right to wear it; for otherwise it has no right more than so much other gold, unless it be kept in a fine case. Now when the king does any illegal act, and so ceases to be king, what becomes of the crown? It is in the clouds; for it is upon no body's head, because no body is king! What does the *Observer* then mean by coercing the crown?

R. This is to distinguish the authority of the king from his person. And if the *Observer* will take the word of an act of parliament, this is a traitorous position by the act of uniformity.

8. C. But what does he mean by saying, that such a king loses the name of king. (I suppose he means *de jure*, and not *de facto*; for in fact he still keeps the name of king, (let him be as tyrannical as he will) still he is put out of possession. We have no other name to call him by.

9. I suppose the *Observer* thinks that the late king *James* did cease to be king ever after he had granted a toleration to the dissenters contrary to law, (yet they thanked him heartily, but now they say hypocritically for it)

it) but still he retained the *name of king*. They did not call him *Mr. Stuart*, nor *Mr. Tyrant*! And they called his father *king of England* when they were *trying* him as a *tyrant*. The executioner called him his *majesty* when his *head* was upon the *block*. But *Mr. Observer* would not have been so *civil*! And all from his mistake of *Lambard* (as you have shewed me before) that a *tyrant* loses the name of *king*; that is, does not deserve it. As we say such a one is not a *man*; but a *beast*, he's a *dog*; which the *Observer* taking *literally*, he shews his *philosophy* upon it!

10. But another thing, *Mr. Observer* — Suppose I do not think that *king* a *tyrant*, whom you think so? And that I think him to be a *tyrant*, whom you think a most excellent *king*, a restorer of *liberty* and *property*, &c. What a confusion will here be about the name of *king*? When hardly *three* shall agree in it! And we shall not know what one another mean by *king* or *tyrant*!

11. *R.* There are but three sorts of *kings* that I know of; that is, *good*, *bad*, and *indifferent*. We shall say nothing of the *bad*; but will the *good*, or the *indifferent* escape? First for the *good*. In my second volume, N. 75. I have quoted a top *whig* proving, that *good kings* are worse than *bad* ones, and more dangerous to our *liberties*, which they may *coax* us out of, while we suspect *bad* ones, and are upon our guard. He compares *good kings* to what we call *good witches*, who seem to cure one, that they may without suspicion bewitch twenty. And we know the *fable*, how the *sun* soothed the traveller out of his cloak, which the *storm* could not force from him. This was a fit argument for this author, who was *solicitor* against king *Charles I.* at his *tryal*; because of the general reputation that *prince* had obtained of being a *good* man. So that we see they want not pretences against *kings*, even for their being *good*!

And for the *indifferent*, we have examples of *kings* deposed propter inutile imperium, because they were neither *good* nor *bad*! So that to be a *king* is *crime* enough with the *whigs*, and they will never want objections against him,

him, let him be *good, bad, or indifferent!* There is none of them but may lose the name of *king*, according to the *Observer*; he would have that name abolished.

12. C. It is *abolished*, if there be never a one in the world deserves it. And there is none according to *Observer*, or ever was; for as you shewed, N. 358, he makes *Solomon* a *tyrant*, and says, he ought to have been *deposed*, as it is in the *Observer* of 10th *July* last, N. 42. Then no man or woman's *wisdom* can secure them. No, nor their *love* to their *country*, and the utmost *care* of it, in making it *rich* and *prosperous*, and preserving it in *peace* and *plenty* all his *reign*. And never *oppressing* any, of which we have not one instance in all the reign of *Solomon*. Yet all this could not prevent rebellious *tribes*, spirited by a *Jeroboam* to call this reign a *grievous yoke!* We have done so in reigns next to *Solomon's* for *peace* and *plenty*. And if we had a *king*, who should promote *trade* like *Solomon*, till he made *silver* as plenty as *stones* in *London*, the *whigs* would fly in his face, and the *Observer* would *unking* him, as he has done to *Solomon*. And if the name of *king* did not belong to him, then, as I said, there is not a *king* or a *queen* now upon the face of the *earth*, or ever were; for none made their *people* so *great* and *rich* as *Solomon*.

Saturday, Oct. 9, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 363

1. The *Observer* tempts me to stay longer with him. He will not let me go to Mr. *Hoadly* yet; but 'tis all one.
2. He complains to the *publick* of me, for not *answering* his argument to prove, that the two *houses* of parliament are co-ordinate with the king in making of laws.
3. All which I answered long ago in the *sluce* and the *mill*. It is further shewed, that they cannot be co-ordinate.
4. The *Observer's* interpretation of, *the king can do no wrong*, proves directly against it. *Bracton's* interpretation of it.
5. There is no law in England before the king.
6. Nor in the world, which the *Review* has owned.
7. A new argument just now sent to the *Observer* in a letter, that the laws against coercion are repealed, which I particularly answered in mine of the 10th of March last.
8. The statute 12 Car. 2. c. 30. which above all others the coercion-men would have to be repealed, is now owned as law in Westminster-hall by queen and parliament and the whole nation; and read by the clergy in our churches, even since the revolution.

1. Coun. **L**ET me beg your patience, master, to say a word or two to the *Observer* we were last upon, N. 57. for though I know you are tired of him, and you were saying you intended to go to something else; yet it may be of use to clear every thing he says before you leave him.

R. I comply with you the more willingly, countryman, because answering one *whig* is answering them all; for they have all but one note, like the *spring-bird*.

I had some business with Mr. Hoadly, to whom I promised to return soon; but have been thus long detained by Mr. *Observer*, who is such excellent company, it is hard to get from him! And yet I have not been far from Mr. Hoadly all this while; for Mr. Hoadly and Mr. *Observer* (upon this argument) are much at one.

2. C. Then, *master*, this same *Observer*, N. 57. complains grievously of you, and appeals to the publick against you, that you will not answer him. He says, *I hope the publick will excuse me to put them in mind (for I doubt not the Rehearsal would willingly have it forgotten) that on Saturday the 17th of August last, I fully proved against him, that our lords and commons have a joint authority with our kings in making of laws; and that without their concurrence, our princes can make none of themselves. To which I have received no answer.*

3. R. He means since he wrote it, but it was fully answered before. Has he forgot the *sluce* and the *mill*? It is in mine of the 12th *June* last; and I will still refer it to any miller in England, whether it is the *sluce* or the *water* that makes the *mill* to go? And I will leave it to the publick to judge, whether every tittle of what the *Observer* said afterwards, is not there answered or obviated beforehand? For I know what they have to say, and they can answer no otherwise than as I have chalked out for them. And they never answer a word to me (the *Observer* has not) only puts the objection over again — And then complains for want of an answer? Come, Mr. *Observer*, have you said any thing to my *sluce* and my *mill*? Tell me, I gave you an argument might be felt, you may see it with your eyes. Does the *sluce* turn the *mill*, though it lets the *water* go that does turn it? And though the *sluce* and the *water* are joint in this, yet they are not co-ordinate. As I say the two houses of parliament are not with the king in making of laws, though they go jointly together. But they cannot be co-ordinate, because whatever authority the parliament has, is derived wholly and solely from the crown. And the power that is derived can never be upon the

the level with that from which it is derived. Both houses of parliament call the king their sovereign lord, and stile themselves his most dutiful and obedient subjects and servants, and swear allegiance to him. Does he swear allegiance to them? Is sovereign and subjects, master and servants, the stile of co-ordinate powers? Mr. Observator, I shall complain to the publick if you do not answer this.

4. C. He has answered it already; for in the same Observator he says, *Our kings have no power but what the law gives them; and therefore it is justly said, they can do no wrong.*

R. Justly said! No, Mr. Observator, it is most unjustly said, as you mean it, and the consequence turns directly against the sense you put upon this; for if the king has no power but what the law gives him; therefore he may do wrong, and is accountable to the law. But if the king derive his authority from God alone (as our laws speak, which I have quoted) that maxim of our law, *that the king can do no wrong*, means only, that he is not accountable to us for any wrong he does; and is of the same import with that of Eccles. viii. 4. *Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, what dost thou?* That is, he has no controuler upon earth. The case is put directly by Bracton (as I have quoted him before) that the king does no wrong, and will not amend that wrong, for all the supplications and remonstrances can be made to him; and even in that case his determination is, *sufficit ei pro pœna*, &c. that it is sufficient punishment to him, that he is to expect God to be an avenger; for he has no superior upon earth. This was his notion of that maxim, *That the king can do no wrong.*

5. C. But what say you to the first part of the assertion, that *our kings have no power but what the law gives them?*

R. What law does he mean? If he means the law of God, I agree with him: But if he means the municipal laws of England, I desire him to shew me those laws.

The first in our *Statute-book* is *magna charta*; which is nothing but a *charter* from the *king*. But being confirmed by several *acts of parliament* afterwards, it passes as a *law*, and I wish it were observed. But this *charter* did not make the *king*, for the *king* made it; and that of his own *mere will and pleasure*, as the *charter* speaks.

6. Then if you go higher, to the *original of laws and parliaments* in the *world*, I desire to know that *parliament*, which made the first *king* in the *world*, and in whose *name*, and by what *authority* that *parliament* was called? This is a *question* I have often asked the *Observer* your *predecessor*, but never could have an *answer*. Should not I complain to the *publick* of this? The *Review* indeed fairly owned it was not to be *answered*. And that all the *schemes* built upon it would not hold water; and therefore gave them all up. Though, like a true *whig*, he sticks to all the *consequences* of them still! For a *whig*, though he gives ground, is not to be *conquered*!

7. C. But, *master*, there is just now come to me by the post, the *Observer* of the 8th last month, N. 59. wherein are two brave *letters* sent to him, for which he is very *joyful*, and prays the *authors* to continue to help him against the *Rehearsal*. Have you *answered* these *before-hand* too? Let me put them to you: One is, I suppose, from some young *whig-lawyer*, who shrewdly observes, that the *declaration* in the *act of uniformity* required to be *subscribed* by the several persons therein specified, of its not being *lawful on any pretence to take arms against the king, &c.* is repealed by the *act 1 William and Mary*. And then he leaves it to the consideration of the *Observer*, whether all other *acts* against *coercion* are not hereby *virtually repealed*, though not *particularly repeated*?

R. I have *answered* this *before-hand* too, as you will see Vol. 4. N. 294. Where after setting down several *acts of parliament* against *coercion*, I forelaw this *objection*. And the *Observer*, or his *letter-writer*, (if they pretend to *answer* me) should have said something to that

that easy *solution* I there give, before they had trump up this *objection* again. But this is their way, and I cannot help it; but I can ease the reader from the tediousness of repetitions. I dare not make so bold as the *Observer*, I want not matter to make out a paper.

8. C. Then let me come in for a stroke, *master*.

In *Easter term* of the 2d year of her present majesty's reign, one *Taylor* a tanner in *Southwark* was fined 40 marks, and sentenced to stand twice in the pillory, for the following words: *King Charles I. was well served in having his head cut off, and 'tis pity his two sons king Charles II. and king James II. were not so served too.* After the case was fairly argued, between the council for the queen, and that for the defendant, my Lord chief justice *Holt* declared, that though the words were spoke of dead kings, yet this doctrine affected the living; and doth not this, said he, justify that horrid tenet of murdering of kings? He then ordered that statute of 12 Car. 2. to be read, whereby the 30th of *January* is made a perpetual fast, &c. From whence he inferr'd, that the principles which prompted the defendant to speak these words are condemned by that statute. These principles (said another judge upon the bench) have overturned one government already, and there are now a set of people, whose doctrine it is, that there is a power above the king, and drink a health to our sovereign lord the people.

All this (and more) a friend of mine took down in his pocket-book. But the *Observer* has excepted against *Westminster-hall*! Well then, he must except against queen and parliament too! For why do they keep the 30th of *January*, if the statute which enjoins it be repealed? (as the *Observer* is labouring to prove!) Why would the clergy read it in our churches?

---

Wednesday, October 13, 1708. No. 364.

---

1. No *act of parliament* in England, no not *Magna Charta*, has so solemn an attestation to it as the *statute 12 Car. II. c. 30.*
2. This looks like *concert* in the *Observer*, but liker a *trick* put upon him, to draw him in to insist upon this *statute.*
3. This *statute* will not, cannot be *repealed.*
4. Either *cobler* and *tinker*, or *king* and *parliament*, must be *judge.*
5. A word to Mr. Ben. Hoadly upon his last *affize-sermon* of *Who shall be judge?*
6. *Coercion* effectually *coerced.*
7. An answer to a letter sent to the *Observer* concerning the *sacrament* being a *sacrifice*, wherein our *liturgy* and *articles* are cleared.

1. Coun. I Think the *Observer* and all our *whigs* and *dissenters* are now intirely demolished as to the point of *coercion*, particularly as to that *statute 12 Car. II. c. 30.* which Mr. *Observer* would have *antiquated* (though at the same time he pleads for the *authenticness* of St. Edward's and the *Saxon laws*) and his trusty *letter-man*, learned in the laws, would have to be *virtually repealed*, for there is no *act of parliament* in all our *Statute-Book* which is so *flagrantly* owned, and with so much *honour*, as this same *statute of 12 Car. II. c. 30.* even at this day; the *queen*, *parliament*, and all the *nation* still observing the *30th of January* in pursuance of that *act.* And it is not only owned as *law* in *Westminster-Hall* (of which I have given a notorious *instance*) but a proclamation containing the substance of it is ordered to be read *yearly* in our *churches* in time of *divine service*, every *Sunday* the next before the *30th of January*, as a preparation for the *sad solemnity* of that day, and so it is intermixt with our *holy offices*, and it is made a part of

of them thus publicly and solemnly in the presence of God, and in the face of the world, to renounce that damnable doctrine of coercion over kings, particularly over the persons of the kings of this realm; either by the pretended authority of parliament or people, or any other person or persons whatsoever.

And there is a penalty for the neglect of reading the proclamation put out in pursuance of that act, and which is indeed a repetition of it. Of which those clergy had need have a care who shall neglect it.

R. There is not so solemn and so authentick an attestation to any other act of parliament as to this, no, not to Magna Charta, which does not come into our churches, as not being supposed to have so much of conscience in it, or of what is essential to the preservation and support of the government, and the peace and happiness of the nation.

2. C. Therefore the Observer insisting upon this particular act, which he knew was so well supported, and offering such silly arguments against it, as of its being antiquated, and virtually repealed, was playing directly to your hand, and cutting the throat of coercion in the most effectual manner! This looks like concert!

But, master, it looks liker a plot of yours to draw the whigs into a noose, and knowing where your fort was impregnable, to drill them on to attack where you were sure to vanquish them, and had a mine to spring would blow them all into the air!

3. R. Nay more, countryman, as I have provoked them to shew one act of parliament which allows of coercion; so now I tell them, that no revolution will allow it, or repeal those laws that condemn it; nor will lie under the scandal of seeming to overthrow the undoubted and fundamental laws of the realm, or what is so declared by act of parliament, as the crown being free from coercion is declared in the statute 12 Car. II. c. 30. which therefore is never like to be repealed, for if it were repealed, that repeal would be disputed, as being contrary to the undoubted and fundamental law of the realm; and it would suppose, that king and parliament

---

Wednesday, October 13, 1708. No. 364.

---

1. No *act of parliament* in *England*, no not *Magna Charta*, has so solemn an attestation to it as the *statute 12 Car. II. c. 30.*
2. This looks like concert in the *Observer*, but liker a *trick* put upon him, to draw him in to insist upon this *statute.*
3. This *statute* will not, cannot be *repealed.*
4. Either *cobler* and *tinker*, or *king* and *parliament*, must be *judge.*
5. A word to Mr. Ben. Hoadly upon his last *assize-sermon* of *Who shall be judge?*
6. *Coercion* effectually coerced.
7. An answer to a letter sent to the *Observer* concerning the *sacrament* being a *sacrifice*, wherein our *liturgy* and *articles* are cleared.

1. Coun. I Think the *Observer* and all our *whigs* and *dissenters* are now intirely demolished as to the point of *coercion*, particularly as to that *statute 12 Car. II. c. 30.* which Mr. *Observer* would have antiquated (though at the same time he pleads for the *authenticness* of St. *Edward's* and the *Saxon laws*) and his trusty *letter-man*, learned in the laws, would have to be *virtually repealed*, for there is no *act of parliament* in all our *Statute-Book* which is so *flagrantly* owned, and with so much *honour*, as this same *statute* of *12 Car. II. c. 30.* even at this day; the *queen*, *parliament*, and all the *nation* still observing the *30th of January* in pursuance of that *act.* And it is not only owned as *law* in *Westminster-Hall* (of which I have given a notorious *instance*) but a proclamation containing the substance of it is ordered to be read yearly in our *churches* in time of *divine service*, every *Sunday* the next before the *30th of January*, as a preparation for the *sad solemnity* of that day, and so it is intermixt with our *holy offices*, and it is made a part  
of

of them thus *publickly* and *solemnly* in the *presence* of *God*, and in the *face* of the *world*, to renounce that *damnable doctrine* of *coercion* over *kings*, particularly over the *persons* of the *kings* of this *realm*, either by the pretended authority of *parliament* or *people*, or any other *person* or *persons* whatsoever.

And there is a *penalty* for the neglect of reading the *proclamation* put out in pursuance of that *act*, and which is indeed a *repetition* of it. Of which those *clergy* had need have a care who shall neglect it.

R. There is not so *solemn* and so *authentick* an *attestation* to any other *act* of *parliament* as to this, no, not to *Magna Charta*, which does not come into our *churches*, as not being supposed to have so much of *conscience* in it, or of what is essential to the preservation and support of the *government*, and the *peace* and *happiness* of the *nation*.

2. C. Therefore the *Observer* insisting upon this particular *act*, which he knew was so well supported, and offering such silly arguments against it, as of its being *antiquated*, and *virtually repealed*, was playing directly to your hand, and cutting the *throat* of *coercion* in the most effectual manner! This looks like *concert*!

But, *master*, it looks like a *plot* of yours to draw the *whigs* into a *noose*, and knowing where your *fort* was *impregnable*, to drill them on to attack where you were sure to *vanquish* them, and had a *mine* to spring would blow them all into the *air*!

3. R. Nay more, *countryman*, as I have provoked them to shew one *act* of *parliament* which allows of *coercion*; so now I tell them, that no *revolution* will allow it, or *repeal* those *laws* that condemn it; nor will lie under the *scandal* of seeming to overthrow the *undoubted* and *fundamental laws* of the *realm*, or what is so declared by *act* of *parliament*, as the *crown* being free from *coercion* is declared in the *statute* 12 Car. II. c. 30. which therefore is never like to be *repealed*, for if it were *repealed*, that *repeal* would be disputed, as being contrary to the *undoubted* and *fundamental law* of the *realm*; and it would suppose, that *king* and *parliament*

are not a *judge* of what is *law*; and if so, then the *repeal* would *repeal* it self, for it could stand upon no other foundation than that of *king* and *parliament*. And by this it would be apparent that *law* and *constitution* signify nothing.

*King* and *parliament* may *repeal* any *law* of their own making, or of any former *parliament*. And so they might this of 12 *Car. II.* if it had only *enacted* against *coercion*, but it did not *enact*, but *recognize* and *declare* what was the *undoubted* and *fundamental law* of *England* from the beginning. And if another *parliament* should *declare* contrary to this, then where should we find our *undoubted* and *fundamental law*? We should be all in confusion, and our *constitution* would be utterly lost.

Therefore I think we may reasonably suppose that no *parliament* will venture upon such a *stroke* as this, for it would *undermine* and *destroy* their own *authority*; and they would be no longer *judges* of what is *law*.

And who then shall be *judge*? Will you, *Mr. Observer*, leave it in the *crown*?——I see you *start* at that! you're *frighted* out of your *wits*! What then would become of your noble *patriot-barons*, of all the *lewd* and *whig-barangues* about *liberty* and *property* from *forty-one* and downwards, whereby the *filly people* were *gulled* into rebellion, and persuaded to *cut* one another's *throats* for fear of their *lives*!

4. But if you will not let both *king* and *parliament* together be *judge* of this matter (as in the case of the *statute* 12 *Car. II. c. 30.*) then who shall be *judge*? must you, *countryman*, and the *Roger* of the *Observer* determine *absolutely* of all our *lives* and *liberties*? A happy *state* indeed! and what *medium* there is, is left to the *Observer*, to *Mr. Hoadly*, or to the best *whig* in *Britain* to find it out! it must be *one* or *t'other*, there's no help for't! Then *chuse ye, chuse ye*, O my dear *countrymen*! O ye, who have the *gift* of *common-sense* left with you yet! shall *cobler* and *tinker*, or *king* and *parliament* be *judge*?

C. But

C. But Mr. Hoadly has found out a judge; he says in his *assize-sermon* at Hertford the 26th of July last, that St. Paul appealed to the laws, and pleaded his privilege as being a Roman.

5. R. Is appealing and pleading a judging of the cause? Then every council at the bar is a judge! Yes, says Mr. Hoadly, he's judge of what he thinks fit to say. And every man is judge whether he will sue another, or if he thinks his cause is just. This is bantering and punning upon the word judge, not to be excused in a Frenchman, if he spoke it in earnest; but in a sermon (and before a judge too) it was intolerable! Would he pause upon the court at that rate! but every body will judge that he is stupidly or wilfully blind, who cannot or will not see the difference betwixt a judgment of discretion and of authority, which I had so plainly told him that he could not mistake. No, he did not mistake it, it was a wilful and studied prevarication to deceive his auditors, and lead them into sin, and the destruction of both their souls and bodies! and all this rather than he would undergo the shame of repentance! I allow his parts and learning, which he has shewed upon other occasions; and it is visible by that he pleads guilty, and sees that he cannot defend his cause, or justify the principle of coercion, therefore when he can argue no more, he dodges and shifts to cheat as many as he can into perdition! A true whig, who cannot repent, and resolves to die hard! I pray God touch his heart. It is past the power of man, when I am satisfied he sees the truth, but will not own it! But the post he is in to corrupt others, and harden them in their wickedness, will oblige me to take him to task yet again, and since I cannot convert him, I will endeavour to disable him from doing any more mischief, by shewing the fallacy of his arguments, and giving some antidote to the poison of rebellious principles he instils in the heart of the great city, where he is unhappily placed (and where there are too many susceptible to receive such impressions) and in his hawking to assizes, the next most publick places; and then printing his sermons, to spread the infection through the nation.

But

But when I meet next with Mr. Hoadly, I would have some time with him, and not be diverted; therefore I will take leave of Mr. *Observer* for a while, unless you have something else to say to me from him.

6. C. Nothing more, *master*, about *coercion*; you have *coerced* that so effectually, (particularly as to our *laws* and *constitution*) that I suppose you will hear no more of it from the *Observer*, or any body else. That's damned for ever.

But, *master*, there is another *letter* in the same *Observer*, N. 59. wherein he rejoices exceedingly! and before you part with him, I wish you would say something to it; it is about another subject, that of the *sacrament* being likewise a *sacrifice*, and the *Observer* thinks he has had great help from this *letter*.

R. Just what he had from the other *letter* about *coercion*! and it has been answered already, as I have shewed you the other was.

7. By the learning and the *phiz* of it, I guess it to be from some little *prig* of a *non-con*, who would be meddling, and may gain *reputation* in being overcome, for that he had *ventured*! — I challenge the *Rehearsal* (says he) to shew me in what part of the service of the church the priest doth offer that sacrifice. If he would know the sense of our church in this matter, let him first look into the second part of the homily, concerning the sacrament; and there he will find, That the godly father's named it *Eucharistia*, that is, *thanksgiving*; whence it has with us the name of the *Eucharist*. And in the collect immediately after the celebration, we pray God, *Mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving*. In the Greek translation it is the sacrifice of the *Eucharist*, and there is no *thanksgiving* at all in that collect to which this might refer, it is all *supplication* and *intercession*; and there we offer this sacrifice on behalf of our selves, and of all the whole church; and say after, *Although we be unworthy to offer unto thee any sacrifice* — In the first liturgy of king Edward VI. and in the Scotch-liturgy this collect is put before the consecration. But all the

the difference is, that in the one we pray God to accept the sacrifice we are now about to offer, and in the other, what we have now offered.

In the preface to Mr. Scandret's book of *Sacrifice the Divine Service*, to which I referred you, N. 337. you will find several bishops, divines, and other learned men of the church of England, far from all suspicion of popery, who have asserted the holy sacrament to be a sacrifice as fully as I have done.

Now, Sir, it is incumbent upon you to shew where the church of England has denied this holy sacrament to be a sacrifice. But what she says in her articles against the popish sacrifice of the mass, you (modestly!) turn, as if meant of that sacrament and sacrifice which she herself does offer.

---

Wednesday, October 20, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 365.

---

1. The letter that would make me a *popish*, writes in defence of *popery* against me. He looks like a *jesuit*—But for his *wit*!
2. The *Observer's* authority from the *beathen*, as to the power of the *people*, makes against him.
3. And likewise as to the *council of Basil*.
4. He falls upon me for what the lord *bishop of Sarum* has asserted.
5. His *insolence* in saying that the *queen*, when *princess*, joined with those who were in arms against her father. The contrary shewed from the *declarations* of the *prince of Orange*.
6. He allows not that the *queen* has any right by *inheritance*, contrary to the *addresses* of the *nation*.
7. He owns himself a *traitor* by making the *queen* an *usurper*, if she will not allow of *coercion* over her self.

1. Coun. **T**HE letter printed in the *Observer*, N. 59. which you were upon last time, *master*, says it was a *pious fraud* in you to say, "That, accord-

according to the papists, the sacrament was a bloody sacrifice, for that the papists make it an unbloody sacrifice, as may be seen at large in the Catechism of the council of Trent, in *Bellarmin*, and in the bishop of *Meaux*.

R. The papists make it so—that is, they would make it so if they could; I know very well they pretended to do it, and call theirs an *unbloody sacrifice* (as I have told you before) because it was the language of the *primitive church*, and to avoid the objection of *Christ* being sacrificed anew. Against which I argued, That if it was *real blood*, according to the notion of *transubstantiation*, then it was *really a bloody sacrifice*. And if this gentleman has any thing further to say on behalf of the *papists* in this point, he may speak; and let the world judge which of us two is most inclined to *popery*, and on whose side the *pious fraud* does lie, whether on mine, who lay this charge upon *popery*, of theirs being a *bloody sacrifice* (which would effectually overthrow their notion of *transubstantiation*, and make it abhorrent to all *Christians*, and even to the *papists* themselves) or on the side of this gentleman, who here endeavours to clear them from this charge?

Have a care, Mr. *Observer*, that some *jesuit* does not *paume* upon you, under the *mask* of a *non-con*! It is not the first time, you know, they have made use of that *pious fraud*!

And this may make him so angry with me, as to ask you this civil question concerning what I have said, *Pray, how do you call this, ignorance, folly, or a worse name?* His *rhetorick* has flagged here a little, he should have found something more distant from *ignorance* than *folly*! Was there nothing else in his head? But he may call me what *name* he pleases, and make any thing of what I have said but *popery*! for it is the direct *opposite* to that.

2. C. You have shook off this small gentleman. But pray, *master*, before you quit the *Observer*, let me know what you have to say to a great *authority* he brings against

against you, *Num.* 60. as to the power of the *people*, it is no less than that of a *general council*, as he says, which, as he quotes it, sets the *people* above the *king*, and refers to one *Cicero*, saying, *It is certain there was a time when the people lived without kings.*

*R.* But why did not *Mr. Cicero* name that time? He could find none in all his *heathen histories* before the *Grecian commonwealths*. *Justin* begins his *history* with owning that *Initio rerum nationumque imperium penes reges erat*, i. e. *That from the beginning of things and nations, kings held the government.* And *Tacitus* begins thus, *Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere*, i. e. *Kings had the government of Rome from the beginning.*

But *countryman*, how oft have I told you, in answer to our *whigs*, that they took their notions of the *original of government*, and the *power of the people* from the *heathen*, who knew not the *original of the world*, or of *mankind*, and how then should they know the *original of government*? Therefore I endeavoured to bring our *whigs* to the *history* of the *holy scriptures*, where all these things are very particularly set down. But I have not been able to persuade them to this; they will stick to their *heathens* still! not to their *histories*, for I will appeal to that, but to their *conjectures* how it was in the *times* before those of which their *histories* speak. And of this they know no more than *beetles*. How should they know it! They fancied *government* framed by the *people*, as the *world* by the *concourse of atoms*; both alike *feasible*! and we may as well dispute the one as the other, against the *fact* of *holy scripture*, how the *world*, and how *government* began. But when these *heathens* came to believe the *holy scriptures*, they saw their former *folly*, and reformed their notions; they then saw plainly that *government* was the *immediate institution of God*, without any *intervention of the people*; and that the *whole authority of government* was derived wholly and solely from *God*, and is his *authority*, which he has put into the hands of *men*. And hence arises the only obligation of *conscience* to submit to any *government* what-

whatsoever. And hence it is that *damnation* is pronounced against *resistance*, as being a *resisting* the ordinance of God.

C. You have sufficiently instructed me in this, *master*; and I am fully satisfied as to the *beatben*. It is plain whence their ignorance of the *original* and *obligation* of government did proceed.

But what shall we say to this *general council* produced by the *Observer*? I know not whether he has quoted the *council* right, or they quoted *Cicero*?

R. You need not trouble your self, *countryman*, about that; take it as he puts it, for it makes all for me against him.

C. That's strange indeed! for it plainly sets the *people* above the *king*.

R. It does so. But, *countryman*, it was a *popish council*, every man and mother's son of them were all *papists*.

C. O! were they so? then I have him——This *Observer*, without doubt, plays *booby*! What did you give him, *master*, to set this down? You have all along laid it in their dish, that these *whigs* and *dissenters* have borrowed their principles of *coercion* and the power of the *people* from the *papists*. And now the *Observer* has made it good! He has no other *authors* to produce against you but *pagans* and *papists*! And if he had read that *sheet*, of one side, you have several times recommended to him, of the *Two Sticks* (the *papists* and the *presbyterians*) made one, he would have found forty other instances besides this *council* of *Basil*. Yet I'm a *papist* for opposing this *popery*, and he's a true blue *protestant* for defending it, and pleading it in his justification!

4. R. But I thought he would have paid more deference to his good friend the worthy lord *bishop* of *Sarum*, whom I did my self the honour to quote on my side, saying, *That the assertors of the pope's supremacy were the first* (among *Christians*) *who set up the power of the people*; for thus they argued, that the pope representing the whole catholic church, consequently the power of the people

people was devolved upon him, and so he might dispose of crowns at his pleasure. And upon the comparison he judiciously determines, that it were better in the pope than in the people, and that less mischief would come of it. So that if the *Observer* will make me a papist for this, he has been so kind as to give me good company!

5. C. But he has clinched the matter in his next *Observer*, N. 61. where he argues, "I prove what I say thus; her majesty is so far from denying those liberties, and particularly that of our power of coercion over tyrants, that when she was princess, she actually joined—those who took arms against the late king James."

R. I am amazed at his boldness! The princess went a journey, and the *Observer* presumes to say, it was to join those who were in arms against her father! Did she make any such declaration? Or was *Observer* in the secret? How else should he know it? But I have learn'd other things than to pry into the councils of princes, or to guess at their secret intention, when they do not think fit to declare it themselves; and then we are bound to believe it!

But whatever she did, does this repeal the laws against coercion? Had the princess power to repeal laws? He will not allow that to the queen.

6. C. But he says, that "her majesty, when she came to the crown, accepted it upon the terms of the declaration of right which was founded on the power of coercion."

R. Let him prove it was so founded. And there is not a word of coercion in the declaration of right. How oft have I corrected him for this? He will asperse the revolution, and give the lye to our late glorious king, and all his declarations, and to the convention too, and their abdication instead of coercion; he will have them to be the same, let me do what I can!

But why should not the queen accept of a crown that descended to her by inheritance? for was not she the next in the line? Will the *Observer* deny it? And if she

she was likewise named in a *revolution-act*, did that make her *title* the worse? How many *addresses* through the nation did own her right by *inheritance*, and congratulated her accession to the *throne* of her *ancestors*?

7. Now if the *queen* will not own that there is a *coercion* over her by *law*, and will not confirm all those *liberties* granted by king *John* to the *barons*, that is, to *dethrone* her, to *seize* her *forts*, *castles*, &c. and to *disfranchise* her *person* all manner of ways, if they think she does not govern right, then the *Observer* has granted himself to be a *traitor*, in making her a *tyrant* and *usurper*, they are his own words, and this is the last defence he has to make, see mine of the 8th last month, to which he refers.

Saturday, October 23, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 366.

1. The *Observer* goes the farther in the deeper, in treason against the queen.
2. I have no personal prejudice to him, but love to my country.
3. Former rebellions are now recommended, particularly that of the barons, who are called noble patriots.
4. They were the greatest enemies to England. They gave three counties to the Scots, to help them in their rebellion. And chose Lewis of France for their king.
5. The presbyterian barons copied after them.
6. The *Observer* scolds at me, to see if he can make me scold.
7. He says I hold but one error in the church of Rome, because I said that there is one which supports the rest.
8. His abominable insolence in saying, that king William, queen Mary and queen Anne joined with pope Innocent XI. to depose their father.
9. His putting it upon me will not help him, for he can shew no such words of mine; and to say I meant it, is ridiculous. That would be an easy excuse for any scandal. So that it is all his own.

1. *Coun.* **I**Nstead of opposing the *Observer*, I profess, master, I begin to pity him. I see not how ever he'll get off from that charge of treason you have exhibited against him. He pleads the charter of king John as law, and for coercion, and says, That those liberties (which he granted to the barons) were never denied but in times of tyranny and usurpation. To this when you had told him they were denied at this day; that they were treason by the law now at this time; and that this assertion of his would infer, that this very time was a time of tyranny and usurpation, therefore did warn him of the danger, and cautioned him to advance no more such treasonable positions: but he stands bluff, and will not

not give back an inch! Nay, he brings it nearer home to her Majesty still, and urges her own example when she was princess, as a proof of his doctrine, and to justify coercion over her self now that she is possessed of the crown! For this you gave him due correction in your last, and have so turned the argument upon him, that I cannot see for my life which way he can extricate himself! he is in for cakes and ale—over shoes and boots: you have so wire-drawn him with your arguments from one thing to another, that he has plunged himself over head and ears, and now, *The farther in the deeper*—I hope you mean no prejudice to his person.

2. R. No, countryman, I wish no personal prejudice to him or any body else. My business is only to battle principles, and to save the poor people, if I can, from being led like fools to the correction of the stocks, to be persuaded by such treasonable principles as now flie abroad, to destroy their own happiness, and being led into sedition, to worry and devour one another, to preserve their liberties and properties!

3. To carry on this design, the former rebellions are mustered up and commended, particularly that of the barons, who are represented to the people as noble patriots, the assertors of their rights, and the curb of tyranny! And the charter they extorted from king John with their swords at his throat, is now called the *Magna Charta* of our liberties (to rebel) and which the *Observator* says, are never denied but in times of tyranny and usurpation.

Now to open the eyes of the people a little, it will not be amiss to give them a sketch of their worthy patriots the barons, and by what ways and means they wrought themselves into that power to distress their kings at the rate they did, and to obtain such charters from them.

4. Know then, O my deluded countrymen, that these barons, to strengthen themselves, entered into a confederacy with Alexander the second king of Scots, to whom, in consideration of the assistance he was to give them  
against

against their own lawful king, they assigned the three counties of *Northumberland, Westmorland, and Cumberland*. And Mr. Rymers, in his second letter to the bishop of *Carlisle*, tells us, there is extant an inventory of *Charters* made by order of *Alexander the III. king of Scots*, amongst which are these three, viz. A confederacy between the *barons* and the king of *Scots*. 2d. An assignment of *Northumberland, Westmorland, and Cumberland* by the *barons* to the King of *Scots*. And the third, A confirmation of the said grant of the *barons* by *Lewis* son of the *French king*, whom they had chose for their king.

C. A thousand thanks to you for this, *maſter*. Now let me see who dare name the *barons* to me, but as a company of *whigs* and *traitors*! O *villains*! What! sell the nation! give away whole counties by their own authority to the king's enemies! nay, give the whole kingdom to the *French king's son*, that is, to *France*! Are these the noble *patriots*! the assertors of the rights and liberties of the people of *England*! And must the *charters* they forced from their kings by these means, granting coercion over themselves, be now put upon us for law, and as the standing rule of government, even to this queen, that if she will not confirm these *charters*, she must be a tyrant and an usurper to the *whigs*! Are these the loyal men, and her best subjects!

5. R. How much was this more than the *presbyterian barons* did, in putting themselves under the protection of the *French king* against king *Char. I.* and their inviting the king and queen of *Bohemia* to usurp upon their father and their brother? Of both of which noble plots I have told you before. See N. 325.

C. They're all alike, and the one may very well serve as a precedent for the other. The *popish barons* to the *presbyterian barons*! Are they not ashamed to quote them.

Put them in a bag and shake them,  
Your self o'th sudden would mistake them.

R. Well,

R. Well, *countryman*, have you done with the *Observer* yet? that I may go to something else.

6. C. I must encroach a little more upon you, *master*, to say something to his *Num. 62.* there are *strokes* in it very remarkable. First he charges you with *Billingsgate*.

R. That cannot be, for he says nothing that *angers* me. I *play* with him, and he *snarls* at me. But some that don't read the *Rehearsals* may think that I fall into his *language*.

7. C. He spends almost two long *columns* in naming several *errors* of the *church* of *Rome*, and says you hold but *one*, that is the *pope's supremacy*; therefore you're a *papist*!

R. I said the *supremacy* was that which kept under the *bishops* of the *church* of *Rome* from *reforming* of their other *errors*, of which I named several. And therefore that the *supremacy* was the chief *point* to be insisted upon as that which supports all the rest. I answered this before; and it is so *filly*, I will say no more to't.

8. C. Then, *master*, prepare for a *home thrust* at you! I profess it made all the blood in my body come into my face! He says, that in yours of the 4th last month, you "Spit your venom on the ashes of the late king *William* and queen *Mary*, of glorious memory, and on the face of her present *majesty*—That they joined with pope *Innocent XI.* to depose their father—And that they will join with the pope or the devil, to depose their king."

Bless me! thought I, my *master* is gone now! how could he be so indiscreet to talk at this rate! and I could not suddenly think that the *Observer* would have the impudence to quote him falsely! therefore I ran to the *coffee-house*, and looked that *Rehearsal*, where to my great joy (and exceeding wonder at the *malice* and *face* of the *Observer*) I found not one word of what he had said, you never so much as named, upon any account whatever, either *Innocent XI.* king *William*, queen *Mary*, or queen *Anne*. And he redoubles his thrust,

thrust, and says, "That if such traitorous insolence pass unpunished, there are some who eat her majesty's bread, that don't deserve it." This is beyond *sarling*, it is *biting* with a vengeance, *master*!

R. No, *countryman*, it is but *snapping* as *mad-dogs* do. I was charging *popes* with abetting *treasons*, and sometimes even assisting *sons* to *depose* their *fathers*. And hardly any that read it could avoid thinking of that famous instance of the emperor *Hen. V.* who was instigated by the *pope* to *rebel* against his father *Hen. IV.* and to *depose* him. Which he did, having first procured a *decree* of the *States* against his *father*, and then he *succeeded* him, and persecuted him all his life after. But the *Observer* will have it meant of no body but of king *William*, queen *Mary*, and queen *Ann*, and that *pope Innocent* the *XI.* (whom I never named) set them on work, and assisted them to *depose* their *father*! I will not say what is due to so bold a *reflection* as this—— But I'm glad I did not make it.

g. C. This *Observer* minds me of *Tutchin*, his predecessor, who would always be explaining your *meaning*, *master*! Whatever *ill thing* you mentioned, he would swear you *meant* king *William* and the *revolution* by it! nay, though you named *Oliver*, and applied it to him, no matter for that—— he was sure you *meant* somebody else, and he would *apply* it! and by this means run himself into twenty *treasons*! And sometimes you would lay *traps* for him, and say beforehand, now for a wager the *Observer* bites at this; and he seldom missed! and he has got one to fill his room! but that you *Mr.* present *Observer* fall not into this mistake any more, I will tell you (without a *fee*) that he who *applies* makes the *scandal*. If I say, a *rogue*, and you say I *meant* such a one, you may be prosecuted for *scandal*, and you only are answerable; so look to it hereafter; you have fair warning.

Wednesday, October 27, 1708. N<sup>o</sup>. 367.

1. A true description of *patriots*, shewed in the *barons* dealing with king *John*; and what they got by bringing in a *foreigner*.
2. What *fools* the *people* are made by their *patriots*.
3. *Edward* the *confessor* was an *usurper*.
4. This the reason why the *Observer* so *be-saints* him.
5. And because at his death he left the *crown* to a *foreigner* from the lawful *heir*, upon whose *father* he had *usurped*.
6. How some men come to be thought *saints*.
7. How the conqueror tricked the *English* as to *oaths*.
8. The *Observer* stabs the *revolution* to the heart, and owns it to be contrary to all our *laws*.
9. His *modest assurance* in affirming that he had quoted *acts of parliament* for *coercion*! Thus he gulls the *people*.

Coun. **Y**OU have in your last, *master*, made a fair riddance of our *patriot barons* and their *rebellions*, which are trumped up by our *modern whigs* as the noblest examples we can follow!

1. R. I will go with the *whigs* through all ages, and I believe they will hardly find an exception, that they who set up for *patriots*, and *assertors* of the *liberties* of the *people* against their lawful *kings*, were the curfedeft *villains* that ever the earth bore; and who, when they prevailed, over-run all *law* and *justice*, and trampled upon the *people* and *squeezed* and *oppressed* them, far beyond any *tyranny* can be shewed in their lawful *kings*.

Of which no instance can be greater than that of these *barons* who set up for *patriots*; for instead of defending the just *rights* and *liberties* of the *people*, they took upon them to govern them *absolutely* and *despotically* at their own will and pleasure, so as no *king* ever did, to *sell* them and *dispose* of them, and all that they had, even to  
foreign

foreign nations. They gave away and alienated *three whole counties of England* at one time to the *Scots*, to help them in their *rebellion* against their king; nay, they bestowed the whole kingdom of *England* to *Lewis the Dauphin of France* (they were fond of *foreigners*) whom they brought over, and crowned him at *London*, *May 20, 1216*. And having by these means distressed king *John* to the utmost, they forced that *charter of coercion* from him, which the *Observer* would have to be good law, and obligatory upon all his *successors*, even upon queen *Anne*, under the pain of their being thought *tyrants* and *usurpers*, and so to have forfeited the *crown*.

But king *John* deserved all this (though not from his rebellious *subjects*) for he himself had *usurped* the *crown* from his *nephew* his elder brother's son, whom he afterwards *murdered* to secure his title.

C. Then his title was good, though he came wickedly by it. But what were the *male-administrations* of his reign, for which the *barons* took arms against him?

R. It is said the *English* hated him for his tyrannical *taxes*, and severe dealings with the *churchmen*, for he *outed* the *prelates*, and seized their goods.

C. And did their new king *Lewis* mend the matter?

R. All the wrong way, for their deliverer proved a greater *oppressor* than their king. And when king *John* was dead, they took arms against *Lewis*, and forced him back to his own country; and, being in confusion, they could find no way to peace or quietness, but to restore the king's son (*Hen. III.* then but ten years old) to the throne of his father. And thus, after all the expence of their rebellion, they found themselves just where they began! *Lewis* did not love the *English*, for as the *history* tells us, he said, *They were a vile and scandalous people for their treasons, and never to be trusted, since they had forsaken their own sovereign lord*; and therefore had privately resolved to *extirpate* them, and bring over his own countrymen. And this was but natural to a *foreigner*, who must love and trust his own countrymen more than those *strangers* who could not be faithful to

their own natural-born prince. He may love the *treason* that advances him to a *throne*, but he must *hate* the *traitors*, and never *trast* them, who are so used to *rebellion*.

But none of these things come into the heads of men once engaged in *treason*. They must support it, because it is their own doing. They will bear a thousand things from an *usurper* of their own setting up, for the least of which they would fly in the face of their own lawful king; as men will endure more *insults* from a *miss* they keep, than from a *wife*.

And in both cases men of *liberty* will let all go to the *devil*, and go themselves too, rather than *right* should keep its ground!

I have shewed you the like in our Scotch covenanting barons (for rebels of all religions are the same) who put themselves under the protection of the French king, in opposition to king *Char. I.* the best king that ever England saw. And this was for the security of the *protestant* religion, and to preserve the rights and liberties of the people!

2. C. But had they the consent of the people? Did they put it to the vote of the people, whether they would be under French government or not? Or did all the people in Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, agree together, that they should be put under the dominion of the Scots?

R. No, poor fools! their consent was never asked; they were to be disposed of by their worthy patriots, the noble assertors of their liberties and properties! Who would mistrust a patriot!

C. O, rogues! rogues! Are these your patriots, you whigs! I shall hate that name again as long as I live, and whoever sets up for a patriot in opposition to his prince, there I see a villain in grain, who seeks nothing but his own interest, and would sink or sell the nation to foreigners, if he could make a shilling by it! And thus the people are gulled, and have been led to their own destruction, in all ages, by their patriots!

3. R.

3. R. I have one instance more to give you of this, countryman. It was one of these patriot-barons, the earl Godwin, who persuaded that silly man Edward called the confessor, to usurp the crown from Edward his nephew then abroad in a foreign court. And what was earl Godwin's design by this? only to aggrandize his family, and make his daughter a queen, whom the confessor married on condition the earl would help him to the crown; which he did by calling an assembly of the states at Gillingham, where they voted the confessor to be king, the right heir being then out of the kingdom.

4. C. Now I know the reason why the Observator is so diligent to saint this king, whose laws he recommends to us. He never misses to call him saint Edward. The pope and the Observator make saints of usurpers! and yet the presbyterians will not give the name of saint to an apostle, though they call themselves the saints of the earth! and in their expositions say, as master Calvin has it upon Paul in such a chapter and verse. They should at least have made him master Paul, as well as John Calvin!

5. R. You see there are some popish saints will go down glib with these gentlemen! But I will give you some further reasons why they allow and call this Edward a saint. He (like a wise man!) invited a foreign prince, William duke of Normandy, to come and make him a visit into England, who was related to the crown, but not the next in blood. And William made a good use of his time, and established an interest in England, whereby he found means to succeed to the crown before his turn came. Nay, he so ingratiated himself with the confessor, that at his death he left the crown to this foreign prince his cousin, and excluded Edgar Atheling the next heir, son to his nephew Edward, upon whom he had usurped.

C. This was worse than his first usurpation. To entail his wrong—But how came he to be sainted at this rate?

6. R. O! he said his prayers, and went constantly to mass; he did neither swear nor drink; and was not this

a *saint*? Some regard not what a man *does*, but how he *looks*! If you are *demure*, and have a *sanctified* face, you may *usurp*, *rebel*, or any of those *small* matters! so you give not *scandal* in your *conversation*!

C. The *devil* can neither *drink* nor *whore*, but he can *rebel*, and was the first *rebel*, as you have taught me.

R. What signifies *rebellion*, and ten thousand *murders* that follow it, so we keep the *Sabbath-day*! What is *lying* and *cheating*, *swearing* and *forswearing* to this!

7. C. And *William* the *conqueror* did both, if he *favours* to *St. Edward's* laws, as the *Observer* says; and if they be such as he would represent them, that is, granting *coercion* over himself; for to be sure the *conqueror* meant no such thing.

R. The *Observer* of the 14th last *August*, N. 52. quotes from *Lambard's Saxon laws*, that it was in the fourth year of the reign of *William* the *conqueror* that he commanded twelve *wise men* to collect these laws, &c. So that he held not his *title* from them; for he was in full possession of the *crown* before, and had reigned four years.

And by that time perhaps he found out the humour of the *English*, who are fond of *oaths*, though never the better for't! therefore if they would have a *may-pole*, they should have a *may-pole*! And if he made no *conscience* either in *taking* or *breaking* his *oath*, he served them in their own kind.

But we can make nothing of this matter, unless we had the *form* and *words* of the *oath* which he took. Dr. *Hicks* in his first *Saxon Grammar* has printed the old *Saxon coronation oath*, which is without any conditions. And in his last *Saxon Grammar* he has given us a *charter* of this king's, signed *William conqueror*. This was the

common manner of his signing,  $\begin{array}{c} W \\ \hline C \end{array} \begin{array}{c} m \\ \hline qf \end{array}$  So that it seems he

did not relinquish his *right* as *conqueror*: he thought it the most indisputed title with the *English*! except in a *pastoral*, to make a *jest* of it!

C. He

C. He had a + in the middle of his name. It is a wonder they did not *saint* him too! But I think there were few *saints* of his name.

8. But, *master*, the *Observer* of the *first* last month, N. 57. says, "If the laws against coercion—which assert the authority of the crown to be derived from God alone, be allowed as a good plea against the declaration of rights, the late *James's* dethronement, her majesty's title, and the settlement of the *Hanover* succession, I will fairly own my mistake."

R. This is stabbing the *revolution* to the heart, in the sense of the *Observer*, who will have it the *dethronement* of the late king *James*, and will not go upon the *abdication*, as the *convention* went, of which I have often admonished him; for if you will put the *revolution* upon the foot of *coercion*, as the *Observer* and the *whigs* will have it, the world cannot save it from being in direct opposition to those *laws* which condemn *coercion*, and assert the authority of the *crown* to be from God alone, of which I have quoted some, N. 294. None of which the *Observer* denies, or can put any other sense upon them.

9. C. But he says, Num. 64. the 25th of Sept. last, I have fully proved from *acts* of parliament, that our fore-fathers had a power of coercion over their princes.

R. If he has named one *act* of parliament to that purpose, then I eat up the moon last night at supper! The intolerable assurance of some men! Has he quoted any thing but *Lambard*, *Ingulphus*, and such like? And are these *acts* of parliament? See, good folks, how you are cheated!

---

 Saturday, Oct. 30, 1708. No. 368.
 

---

1. King Henry I. whose *charter* the *Observer* quotes, was an *usurper*.
2. He quotes none but *usurpers*, *Edgar Atheling*, the right *heir* of the *træwon* of *England*, nobly entertained by the *king* of *Scots*, who *conquer'd* the *conqueror* on his behalf.
3. The *nation* of the *Scots* always *brave* and *loyal*. They were *sold* by the *covenant* into the hands of an *English* *usurper*, who *enslaved* them.
4. Why the doctrine of *coercion* has been more countenanced by *usurpers*, than by *lawful* kings.
5. The frequent *usurpations* that have been, confirm the *right* the more.
6. The account of the *Debates* of the *two houses* is a *book* of no *authority*. It makes directly against *coercion*, for which the *Observer* brings it.
7. The reason why the *convention* went upon *abdication*, and not upon *coercion*.
8. How the *Observer* has been drawn into *treason*. He is *sub misericordia*.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* of 21st *August* last, N. 54. Besides the *charter* of king *John* for *coercion*, quotes another of king *Henry I.* not so express, but favouring it a little, and restoring the laws of *St. Edward*. You have explained that *usurping* *saint* to me sufficiently. And that other *usurper* king *John*, who was as good a *saint* as t'other, for ought I know; for it is said of him, that he gave a great deal to the *poor*. He only *usurped* the *crown* for that good end! And he *robbed* the *church* too, *depriving* the *prelates*, and seizing their revenues. I have enough of him ——— But you have said nothing of this king *Henry I.* and of his *charter*. What sort of a *king* was he?

R. He

R. He was an *usurper* too, upon *Robert* his elder brother; whom he vanquish'd with the help of the *loyal barons*! and kept him in *prison* till he died. He might have been a *saint* too, for he built *abbies* and *churches*.

2. The *Observer* quotes none but *usurpers* for coercion. First his *Saint Edward*, then *William the conqueror*, to whom this precious *saint* left the *crown* from *Edgar Atheling*, the right *heir*; who, being deserted by the still *loyal barons*! gave *William* an easy access to the *crown*, after one *battle*, wherein *Harold the usurper* was slain. And when the *archbishop of York*, with many of the *nobility* and the *Londoners* were preparing to fight for *Edgar* the lawful *heir*, then a hopeful young *prince*, two ambitious *barons*, *Morcar* and *Edwin*, (each of whom had a design upon the *crown* for himself) broke their measures, and withdrew their forces. And thus they fell a sacrifice to a *foreign yoke*, who served them as they deserved, divided their lands among his *Normans*, and made their *laws* speak *French*, as a mark of their *servitude*, from which we are not yet set free. All which fell upon them, for not adhering to their lawful *king*; who, thus deserted, fled into *Scotland*, where he found a generous reception from *king Malcolm III*, who married his sister, and refused to deliver him up to the *conqueror*, when he sent to demand him, but engaged in a war upon his account, and gave *William* so many overthrowes in several *battles*, as made him glad to give it over, and submit to a *peace*, upon dishonourable terms, leaving *Cumberland* to the *Scots*, and restoring *Sibert* earl of *Northumberland*.

3. C. O rare *Scots*! they were always *loyal*, always *brave*! till the devil of *whiggism* got in amongst them, and possessed some of them, who (as the corruption of the best things is the worst) proved errant devils——and sold first their *king*, and then their *country* to an *English usurper*, which the *Observer*, out of love to the *presbyterians*, would put upon the *nation*. But you have vindicated the *nation* against him and them, and shewed, that the *parliament* there, raised an *army* to rescue the

king, which the *general assembly of the kirk* did damn, and called it an *unlawful engagement* against their dear brethren the *dissenters* in *England*, who brought as great reproach upon their nation, as the others upon the *Scots*; the one being the *merchant* who sold their king, the other the *butcher* who bought and murdered him. But I hope both nations will take care that their loyalty and their honour be no more stained, by letting men of such principles get into power, who, as sure as rain engendereth hail, will still pursue their principles, and act the same tragedy over again, whenever they are able; for they still please themselves with the remembrance of the last, which they celebrate among us in *calves-head feasts*, and their writers justify and defend the principle! against which, master, you have waged a long war. When it sounds from the *pulpit* as well as from the *press*, for you watch both; but I am glad you have so few opponents among the *clergy*; there are but two *Headlies*, and none that defend them.

But the *Observer* sticks to you still (and he is as good an author, upon this subject, as either of them) though he fights now faint and weary——He has fished for precedents of coercion, and gone a great way for them. He might have found better for his purpose nearer hand, as the *regicide* of king *Char. I.* which was coercion with a vengeance. But he thought it not yet time of day to fall downright upon the *grand-father* of the queen——And the instances he brings are as unlucky; they are all of *usurpers*. There's *Edward the confessor*, *William the conqueror*, *Hen. I.* and king *John*. These are all he has named; and you have shewed all these to have been *usurper*. But I would know a reason why *usurpers* should seem to favour this doctrine of coercion more than lawful kings?

4. R. Because they must make use of this doctrine to dethrone lawful kings; and then it must take some time to wear out this doctrine again. Besides, *usurpers* knowing that they have no good title, must cajole and soothe the people all that they can, and say whatsoever they think will

will *please* them, and *seem* to put themselves wholly in the hands of the *people* ! But there is nothing farther from their thoughts, for as soon as they are fixed in the *saddle*, and think themselves *secure*, then they *spur* the *jade* till they make her *sides* bleed ; and remembering the *tricks* by which she used to throw her former *riders*, they guard against them, and damn all *coercion*, and will *hang* the man dares name it. Then the *case* is altered ; and this ever has been the *case* with all *usurpers*.

C. The reason is plain ; for he who *deposes* another, does not care to be *deposed* himself !

5. But, *master*, these frequent *usurpations* make some think they are *right*, and the settled *rule* of *government* ; at least very *lawful* upon occasion !

R. Why, does often *sinning* make it cease to be *sin* ? It often takes away the *sense* of *sin*. But that *state* is the most *desperate*.

But, *countryman*, this argument turns against them ; for though there has been many *usurpations* and violent *attacks* upon the *right*, that sometimes it seems even *sunk*, yet we see it *rises* again, and there is no rest nor quietness till the *right* be restored. And this shews the *force* of it more than if it never endured any *shock* ; for then it could not be said to *overcome*. And *usurpation* supposes *right*, else it were no *usurpation*.

6. C. Well, *master*, now look to your hits ! the *Observer* of the 2d. instant, Num. 66. has proved *coercion* upon you——or he'll never prove it ! It is from the *debates betwixt the two houses*, printed 1695.

R. That's a private *pamphlet* wrote by no body knows who ; it is of no authority at all ; you or I might write such another, and set it a going, if we thought fit. I'm sure I have heard some concerned in those *debates* say, they were foully *misrepresented* in it, neither all they said set down, and much more which they never said, but *speeches* made for them.

C. Nay, if you stop one at the beginning, there's no talking with you——You will not let a man tell out his tale.

R. Well, you shall tell out your tale. Now what do these *debates* say?

C. He quotes the arguments of the lord *Somers*, the lord chief justice *Holt*, the late Sir *John Mainard*, and lord chief justice *Treby*; all proving the case of the late king *James* to be an *abdication*. The last says, "*Grocius* himself, and all authors that treat of this matter, and the nature of it, do agree, that if there be any word or action that doth sufficiently manifest the intention of the mind and will to part with his office, that will amount to an *abdication* or *renouncing*." Then he goes on to prove, that the king had *sufficiently manifested* the intention of his mind and will to part with his crown!

C. My *Observer* is *bamboozled*! Does this prove that *abdication* is *coercion*? Here lord chief justice *Treby* plainly calls it a *renouncing*, and that with the *manifest intention* of the mind and will. Now can any thing be more free than a man's intention and his will? This is plainly against *coercion*; for *coercion* is always against one's will, else it is no *coercion*. A man is not forced when he acts *manifestly* according to his own intention and his will.

7. R. You see here the reason why the convention went upon the point of *abdication*; it was on purpose to avoid that of *coercion*, which they knew to be contrary to all the known laws of the land: therefore they voted that the king had *renounced* his crown, and that with the *manifest intention* of his own mind and will! (as the lord chief justice *Treby* here words it, as quoted by the *Observer* from the *debates*) and that this *renouncing* was what they meant by *abdication*!

8. C. There's nothing upon the face of the earth can be clearer than this. O, my poor *Observer*! And was it this which betrayed thee to assert *coercion*? to run blindfold upon this *highest* of *treasons*? Could you not have been as cautious as the convention, and whatever you had meant, yet to avoid the word *coercion*, which is damned by our laws; and for which the law has  
banged

*changed thee already. The rest is only the executive part. You are sub-miserordia.*

Wednesday, Nov. 3. 1708. No. 369.

1. The abdication of the late king *James* was a free and voluntary renouncing of the crown, as lord chief justice *Treby* says, &c.
2. I present the *Observer* with another speech.
3. The speech.
4. What *England* would have gain'd, by taking good advice in time.
5. The difference betwixt the resignation of king *Richard II.* and of king *James II.*
6. King *James* his withdrawing himself made a remarkable difference. And the little reason he had for it!
7. King *Richard* did stay, and forc'd the people to a coercion.
8. The distinction betwixt a fair abdication-revolution, and a coercion-revolution, answers all the objections of the anti-revolutioners.

Coun. **T**HE *Observer* has been very kind to you, master, he has presented you with the debates of the convention about the abdication. Have you nothing to return to him? You ought not to be behind him in civility.

1. R. I do own myself oblig'd to him; for he has set that matter in a very clear light; and made it plain to a demonstration, that what the convention meant by the abdication of the late king *James*, was a free voluntary act of his own, without any force or terror upon him, and this sufficiently manifested (as my lord chief justice *Treby* fully words it) to be the intention of his own mind and will, to part with his office, that is, his crown! which he justly calls renouncing it! and this puts it the farthest in the world from coercion, or any thought of theirs towards it!

2. And

2. And now to be even with him, I will pray him to accept the *speech* of a *bishop* instead of a *judge*, upon somewhat the like occasion. I go a great way off, because I wou'd say nothing might seem to touch upon the present age. Remembring the saying, that he who follows *truth* too near at the heels may happen to have his *teeth* beat out.

Therefore I'll carry him as far back as the reign of king *Hen. IV.* and recommend to his perusal the following *speech* of *Mercks* bishop of *Carlisle*, in *parliament* then, when they were upon the debate of filling the *throne* with *Hen. IV.* (then duke of *Lancaster*, who was nearly related to the *crown*, but not the next *heir*) upon the *renunciation* made by king *Richard* the *second*. As you will find it in *Baker's* history, the beginning of the reign of *K. Hen. IV.* and is in these words.

3. "MY lords, the matter now propounded is of marvelous weight and consequence, wherein  
 " there are two points chiefly to be consider'd; first,  
 " whether king *Richard* be sufficiently put out of his  
 " throne? the second, whether the duke of *Lancaster*  
 " be lawfully taken in? for the first, how can that be  
 " sufficiently done, when there is no power sufficient to  
 " do it? the parliament cannot, for of the parliament  
 " the king is the head. And can the body put down  
 " the head? you may say, but the head may bow down  
 " it self. And so may the king resign. It is true, but  
 " of what force is that which is done by force? and  
 " who knows not that king *Richard's* resignation was  
 " none other? but suppose he be sufficiently out, yet  
 " how comes the duke of *Lancaster* to be lawfully in?  
 " if you say by conquest, you speak treason. For  
 " what conquest without arms? and can a subject take  
 " arms against his lawful sovereign, and not be guilty  
 " of treason? if you say by election of the state, you  
 " speak not reason; for what power hath the state to  
 " elect, while any is living that hath a right to succeed?

Then

Then setting forth the *right* of those who were near in blood than king *Henry*, he says,  
 " But why then is not that claim made? Because,  
 " *Silent leges inter arma*, what disputing of titles against  
 " the stream of power? But howsoever it was extreme  
 " injustice that king *Richard* shou'd be condemn'd, without being heard, or once allow'd to make his defence.  
 " And now, my lords, I have spoken thus at this time,  
 " that you may consider of it before it be too late; for  
 " as yet it is in your power, to undo that justly, which  
 " you have unjustly done.

4. C. It had been good for *England* if they had taken his advice, and while they had power when they cou'd justly have *undone* what they had before *done* very unjustly. It had sav'd them more than a *hundred* Years civil war, which destroyed many branches of the *blood-royal*, extirpated whole *families* of the *nobility*, and cost the *people* more *blood* and *treasure* than in twice conquering of *France*.

But the *parliament* slipt their time (through the just judgment of *God* upon the *nation*) and what they might have done in a good and gracious *reign*, they found out of their power, when they had once suffer'd *Henry* to succeed; who *brib'd* and *bully'd* their *parliaments*, and having corrupted the *fountain*, he made them perfect *slaves*, under the name of *liberty* and *property* and asserting the *rights* of the *people*!

5. But how great was the difference betwixt this *resignation* of king *Richard* II. and that of king *James* II. Here the bishop tells us that of *Richard* was a plain *force* upon him. But judge *Treby* (as quoted by the *Observer*) says, that of king *James* was *free* and *voluntary*, and sufficiently manifested to be the *intention* of his own *will* and *mind*, to *part* with his office. So that, according to the authorities the *Observer* himself has produc'd, he can find no *coercion* in the late *revolution*. Why did he not rather chuse this instance of king *Richard*? Wou'd it not better have serv'd the purpose of *coercion*?

*coercion*? But this shews how wisely he *chose*, and how much better he *proves*! He brings in the *debates* of the *convention*, which most expressly overthrow the plea of *coercion*; it being the very thing they *disown'd*, and study'd to *avoid*!

R. And for this reason they call'd the *resignation* of king James an *abdication*, that is, a *voluntary* act; which it was ridiculous to say in the case of king Richard, because it was a plain *force* upon him, and so was downright *coercion*.

6. Besides, king James his withdrawing himself made a remarkable difference betwixt his *exit* and that of king Richard. When his father king Charles I. of blessed memory, was prisoner in the *Isle of Wight*, it was propos'd to him to make his escape, but he refus'd it, trusting to the justice of his cause—— And was not his son king James unreasonably afraid to be serv'd as his father, or as king Richard? not trusting to all the loyal *addresses* of the *nation* to him, and those most *exceeding* of the *dissenters*, to stand by him with their *lives* and *fortunes*; and the *flagrancy* of the *laws* against all *coercion* upon the *persons* of the *kings* of this *realm*; yet all this notwithstanding, he trusted more to the fable of the *Fox*, who fled (upon a proclamation against *horn'd-beasts*) lest they shou'd say his ears were *horns*! He ventur'd himself, and the fate of a young *child* (he thought his own) to the *honour* even of the *French* king, rather than to the *justice* and *duty* of his natural born *subjects*, and his nearer friends. Does any think (can any but a *whig* think) that his son and *nephew*, or his own daughter, wou'd have hurt a hair of his head if he had stay'd! Sure they're their greatest *enemies* who cou'd harbour such a thought! But he was persuaded to go away, (many evil advices he has had) and so he left the *laws* and *government* to shift for themselves: And thus the *throne* became *vacant*! which cou'd not have been if he had stay'd. And when the *throne* was thus *vacant*, was it not fill'd with the next in *blood*, or by their consent? for both the *princesses* did consent to the prince  
of

of Orange, so that there was no dispute, the one reign'd with him, and the other after him. And I challenge the *Observer* to shew the least infraction of the succession at the revolution.

7. C. But it was not so with king Richard; he obstinately stay'd till he was thrust out of the throne, and forc'd to sign a resignation; that he might leave the objection of coercion as a perpetual blot upon that revolution. For which reason he forc'd them to take his life too, because they cou'd not otherwise secure the government! Nor did the next in blood consent to the duke of Lancaster. Yet this wicked *Observer* wou'd lay all this load upon our late revolution, and the abdication of the convention, by making it all a meer coercion! But he has been happily defeated by the debates of the convention to which he appeal'd, and the revolution vindicated far beyond what he expected! — So that I hope we shall hear no more of his objections against the revolution, his blackening and aspersing it as he has done, by making it coercion, and consequently a rebellion.

8. R. Come near now, all ye anti-revolutioners, and give good heed to this distinction of my countryman, it will save you from many mistakes, and from the misrepresentations which are given by *Observers* and *Reviewers*, &c. of our revolution. Take notice then of the difference (for it is great) betwixt a fair abdication-revolution, and a coercion-revolution. You shall never shew me any evil consequences of the former; as there never was any good consequence of the latter. Like this of king Richard II. which tho' it cost no blood in the turn it self, yet the consequence open'd the veins of the nation, and made them run blood for a hundred years after. And they might have been running on to this day, if the right line had not happily been restor'd; for till then they cou'd see no way to peace, but blood — and more money — was the word!

---

Saturday, November 6, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 370.

---

1. The *Observer*'s reply to *Deut. xvii.*
2. He wholly mistakes the matter.
3. His *assurance* and *positiveness*.
4. Laws prescribed to *kings* by *God*, but not by the *people*. No coercion reserved to the *people* in any of those laws.
5. The 153600 labourers and brewers employed by *Solomon*, were all of the *Canaanites*.
6. The *Observer*'s instance of the *people* chusing their king, makes the most against it in the world.
7. As likewise his instance of *tyranny* in *Solomon*.

1. Coun. **T**HERE is one thing, *master*, you have forgot, through the multitude of other matters crouding in upon you; and it is of consequence, because your not giving an answer to it may lead men to a misunderstanding of the holy scriptures. The *Observer* brought *Deut. xvii.* as a proof of the *people* having a right to *chuse* their king. To this you answered, that there was no such allowance in that chapter, which did *prophecy* of that great *sin* the *people* should commit in asking a king; and if it was a *sin*, then sure the *foretelling* it was no allowance of it. To this the *Observer* replied in his of last *Sept. 29. Vol. VII. Num. 65.* and accuses you most grievously of perverting the text. "I say (says he) that 'tis the most impudent perverting of the text that ever was heard of since the devil perverted the sacred oracles, when he tempted our Saviour in the wilderness; for to every man of common sense, that chapter, from ver. 14, to the end, will appear to be a plain declaration of the duty of a king, and the rules by which he was to govern."

2. R. Who ever denied it? Did I say that the duty of a king was not here set down? But did that hinder it to be likewise a *prophecy* or *foretelling* what was to come?

Does

Does not *ver. 14.* begin, *When thou art come into the land—And shall say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations round about me, &c.* We read the fulfilling of this, *1 Sam. viii.* and in the very words *Moses* here foretells they should say, *ver. 5. Make us a king to judge us like all the nations.* And *ver. 19, 20. Nay, but we will have a king over us, that we may be like all the nations.* Of which *God* says, *ver. 7. They have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.* And *chapter xii. 17. Samuel wrought a dreadful miracle, That ye may perceive (says he) and see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of the Lord, in asking you a king.* Yet this is the precedent insisted upon by the *whigs* and the *Observer*, to shew the right the people have to chuse their king; that is (if you follow this precedent) a right to sin grievously!

But when they had done this great wickedness, *God* did not utterly forsake them, but set down rules and laws for their kings. And those mentioned *Deut. xvii.* are repeated *1 Sam. viii.* Was not that of *Moses* then a prophecy? and not fulfilled till about 450 years after, in the days of *Samuel*, *Act. xiii. 20.* And *God* promised to bless them and their king, if they continued serving the *Lord*. This was pardoning their sin, but not at all allowing it. When *Adam* fell, *God* gave him the promise of the *Messiah*, and gave laws and rules to his posterity besitting their fallen-state? Did not man therefore sin?

3. C. This is plain and easy to me. Where is now the impudent perverting of texts like the devil, which the *Observer* charges upon you for this? It shews only that he did not understand either these texts, or what you said of them.

R. This is a sort of language he is used to; he cannot forbear it. But by this people may see what stress is to be laid upon his assurance, and when he is most positive.

4. C. Let me ask him a question, *master*; that is, whether those laws and rules which are prescribed to kings,

kings, either *Deut. xvii.* *1 Sam. viii.* or any where else in the holy scripture, were prescribed by God, or by the people?

And in the next place, whether in any of them there is a clause allowing to the people a coercion over their kings, if they should transgress any of these laws?

R. Ay, countryman, that is the point. Let the *Observer* and all the whigs in *Britain* beat their brains and see if they can find any such thing! And if they cannot find this, then there is nothing at all to their purpose in the scriptures.

5. C. And yet in this same *Observer* he names *Solomon* over again, his old instance of tyranny, and who (as you have quoted it before) he says ought to have been deposed by the *Israelites*, for his exactions on the people, and particularly that he had 70,000 to bear burdens, and 80,000 to hew in the mountains, and 3600 to oversee them, for the building of the temple.

R. But there was not one *Israelite* among all these. This was the exact number of the strangers that were in the land, and these only were employed in this, as you may see *2 Chr. ii. 17, 18.* They are called those that remained of the *Hittites*, and the *Amorites*, and the *Perizzites*, and the *Hivites*, and the *Jebusites*, whom *Solomon* made tributaries, and put them to this servile work. But of the children of *Israel* did *Solomon* make no servants for his work; but they were men of war, and chief of his captains, and captains of his chariots and his horsemen, *2 Chr. viii. 7, 8, 9.* And was this a good reason why *Solomon* should have been deposed by the *Israelites*? See *1 Kin. ix. 20, 21, 22.*

6. C. This *Observer* sure is the unluckiest fellow ever was born! every thing he says, not only will not answer the purpose for which he brings it, but turns directly against him; so directly, that it would seem concerted betwixt you two! I fancy you'll persuade him to it at last.

R. His instances I confess are very *a-propos* to me, and such as I might have missed, if he had not put them in my

any way ; as that the first time the *people* took upon them to *chuse* their *king*, is noted in the *scriptures* of *truth*, as a most horrible *wickedness* in them, no less than their rejecting *God* himself, that he should not *reign* over them ! How does this confirm the argument I have all along insisted upon ? that for the *people* to *chuse* *kings* for themselves, or any new sort of *government* of their own devising, is *usurping* the *prerogative* of the *Almighty*, the only *author* and *fountain* of *government* ; and therefore, that all *rebellion* against *kings*, who are the *ordinance* of *God*, is a downright *rebellion* against *God*, and a *rejecting* him, that he should not *reign* over us !

7. Again, if the *Observer* had not taken part with the *rebellious* tribes, and, on their behalf, made *Solomon* his instance of *tyranny*, I had lost the best instance in the world, to shew the *unreasonableness*, and the *unsatisfiable* temper of men given to *rebellion* ! And if *Solomon* ought to have been *deposed* (as the *Observer* says) then it is plain that there is no *king* or *queen* upon the earth whom the *whigs* think ought not to be *deposed* ; for they can give no one act of *oppression* in all his reign. He made *silver* and *gold* as plenty as *stones* in *Jerusalem*, 2 *Chr.* i. 15. Infomuch that *silver* was nothing accounted of in the days of *Solomon*, 2 *Chr.* ix. 20. He set them above all their *enemies*, whom he made *tributaries* to them ; And he reigned over all the *kings*, from the river (*Euphrates*) even unto the land of the *Philistines*, and to the border of *Egypt*, ver. 26. And he passed all the *kings* of the earth in riches and wisdom. And all the *kings* of the earth sought the presence of *Solomon*, and they brought every man his present, vessels of *silver*, and vessels of *gold*, and raiment, harness, and spices, horses, and mules, a rate year by year, ver. 22, 23, 24. And because *God* loved *Israel*, to establish them for ever ; therefore made he *Solomon* king over them, to do judgment and justice, ver. 8. And no act of *injustice* can be shewed in all his reign.

Behold now the *king* whom the *whigs* have chosen for an instance of *tyranny* ! and who they say ought to have been *deposed* ! And is *queen Anne* her self safe with these men !

men? Can they find no objections against her, as well as against *Solomon*? Yet they plead for themselves as the men of all others fittest to be employed and trusted by her! But they who make a tyrant of *Solomon*, will find a tyrant in any king or queen, whenever they are so disposed. The best sort of subjects, without doubt!

---

Wednesday, November 10, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 371.

---

1. The *Observer* either ignorant of the scripture, or a wilful prevaricator.
2. *Solomon* put the *Canaanites* under a tribute of bond-service.
3. The nonsense of making *Deut. xvii.* a law of the kingdom and original contract.
4. How the *Observer* makes the abdication to be voluntary, and yet a coercion.
5. He odiously compares the queen's father to a malefactor that deserved to be hanged.
6. The king cannot forfeit his life to the law.
7. The convention did not go upon his forfeiting the crown, but his voluntary renouncing it, which they called abdication.
8. The *Observer* brings proofs directly against himself.

1. Coun. **L**ET me to the *Observer*, to mortify him a little, from what you told me last time, master. He brought a terrible list of no less than 153600 supposed of the poor *Israelites* whom *Solomon* had made slaves, to justify the charge of tyranny against him. But you have shewed that they were all of the cursed nations whom the *Israelites* were commanded to destroy. Now the *Observer* either knew this, or he did not. If not, then he is ignorant of the scriptures, and ill able to argue out of them. But if he did know it (which I think is the most favourable to him to suppose) then how came he not to tell it, but to let his countryman go away with the supposition, that all these were the natural-

ral-born subjects of Solomon, whom he did thus oppress? Was this honest, and like a fair arguer? Here I expose him either way.

But, master, why did they not destroy these Canaanites as God commanded them, rather than make slaves of them?

2. R. You will find that countryman, 1 Kin. ix. 20, 21, 22. *And all the people that were left of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, which were not of the children of Israel, their children that were left after them in the land, whom the children of Israel also were not able utterly to destroy, upon those did Solomon levy a tribute of bond-service unto this day. But of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bond-men: But they were men of war, and his servants, and his princes, and his captains, and rulers of his chariots, and his horsemen.*

C. This is clear. It was his tribute of bond-service furnished him all these 153600 whom he employed in his work. And though he could not utterly destroy all the nations, yet he brought them under this tribute.

3. R. But in the same *Observer* we were upon last time of 29 Sep. last, N. 65. exhibiting his charge against Solomon, he says, *Whereas Solomon had transgressed the law of the kingdom, or original contract in Deut. xvii.*

C. There I have him again! he calls it the law of the kingdom, which was only a law for the king. And it was not imposed upon him by the kingdom or the people, for it was 500 years before the people had a king, or knew they ever should have any. And how senselessly does he call this the original contract, meaning which the people made with their king, and imposed upon him? This is hard fishing for an original contract—And besides, as observed in your last, there was no coercion in this original contract, if they will call it so. So that the whigs are gone, ruined, and undone, every way! I suppose they'll never quote scripture any more!

4. R. Now you're so cock-a-boop and crow over the *Observer*, because you're better versed in scripture than he, I'll try your metal another way; what have you

You to say to his very last of the 6th instant, *Num. 76. last Saturday*, wherein he pretends to answer what I have said of the *debates* of the *convention*; he says, "Though the acts by which he, (the late king *James*) subverted our constitution, were voluntary, and that he obstinately denied a redress, 'tis plain the crown was taken from him against his will, and justly too, because of his subverting those very laws, by which he had it. So that the Rehearser might say, just with as much sense, that an obstinate criminal, who voluntarily does such acts as forfeit his life, does manifestly intend to bring himself to an untimely end, though every body sees that he is condemned by the law, and put into the hands of the executioner against his will."

5. C. First, I say the *comparison* is odious. And secondly, nothing to the purpose. Is it not odious to see the father of the queen that now sits upon the throne (let his mismanagements be what they will in the point of government) treated as a *slave*, as an obstinate criminal in the hands of the executioner! Methinks mere decency to her majesty should have restrained the *Observer* from this sort of language. But men of his principles are used to make familiar with crowned heads!

6. In the next place, his *comparison* will not come up to the case at all; for a criminal forfeits his life by the law; but there is no law to take the life of the king. On the contrary, the very imagining of his death is treason. And the law secures his person from all coercion. And there can be no forfeiture where there is no coercion to exact the forfeiture.

R. But will not the comparison hold thus far, that as a criminal does those things voluntarily which forfeit his life against his will; so the king may do those things voluntarily, which may forfeit his crown against his will?

7. C. If I am rightly informed, there was not a word of the king's forfeiting his crown in all the debates. Those gentlemen of the law the *Observer* quotes, knew too well, that there is no such thing in our laws.

And

And what would *forfeiting* the crown signify, if there was no coercion to take it from him, supposing he had no mind to part with it? Therefore the convention went upon the point of *abdication*, and not of *forfeiture*; and why that, if they were the same? Would the word *abdication* have endured such long debates betwixt the two houses? Now all the question is, what was meant by *abdication*? And for that my lord chief justice Treby says (as quoted in the *Observer* of the 2d last month, N. 66. and quoted by you from that *Observer*) that it was a voluntary renouncing, and sufficiently manifested to be the intention of the mind and will of the king to part with his office. Mark that! Mr. *Observer*, to part with his office. Can you say this of a condemned criminal (to use your respectful comparison!) that it was his intention to part with his life? Therefore you have abused my lord chief justice Treby, the convention, and the revolution! as you have likewise my lord chief justice Holt, whose words you set down in the same *Observer* thus, *Abdication in the most common acceptation from the civil law, is a voluntary act of renunciation, and he thought the commons did so take the word in that case.* He was one of the managers at the conference, and if he may be supposed to know their mind, then this was the sense of the commons too; and all the other managers said the same.

8. And yet the *Observer* quotes these very words, to shew, that by *abdication* was meant downright coercion, that the king did not renounce, but that the crown was forced from him.

And I appeal to any that can read *English*, whether I have not taken *abdication* more in the sense of the convention, than the *Observer*? even from the proofs himself has brought. And now let him go on, and prove coercion against the convention as long as he pleases.

Saturday, November 13, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 372.

1. The *Observer* complains, cries out for help, and loses the laurel.
2. The convention and I against the *Observer*.
3. He puns the queen and the revolution against me.
4. He's got on the wrong side the hedge.
5. He makes the queen an *usurper* upon her father, after he was dead. And arraigns the act of succession.
6. It was impossible the revolution shou'd re-assert coercion.
7. He arraigns the government for vexatious and ground-  
less suits, against honest whigs.

1. Coun. **C**URD on your armour close, master, for the *Observer* is cruel angry, and has vow'd revenge! He says in his of the 3d instant, Numb. 75. *I assure you that I will speak both to such lords and commons as I have the honour to know.*—That is, to have the parliament take notice of you.

R. That would be a great honour to me, that I should do any thing to deserve the notice of the parliament?

But, countryman, in the *rhettorick-school* which you have seen at Billings-gate, the law is, that whoever cries first, or runs away, or calls for help, is adjudg'd to be *versed*, and loses the laurel. And the *Observer* has done all these. He now *repartes* with a *quart-pot* (a dull rogue) for want of wit.—T'other day he made me a *Samson*, and now he wou'd bring the mob upon me. But I shall *run*, and exalt my jaw-bone!

C. Your *est* can't stir. For he has loaded her with *passive-obedience* on the one side, and *non-resistance* on the other! divided betwixt grief and sorrow!

2. R. You *joke* him purely, countryman. But how will you defend your master? he says, *Other people may think what they please, but to me it seems to expose our nation to be a jest to all Europe.*—That is, that the revolution should not be coercion.

C. That's

C. That's a *jest* with all my heart! would that *jest* it a *jest* to Europe? It would be the greatest vindication of it that is possible, if you cou'd make it out. For is there any prince or state in Europe that *loves coercion* over themselves? Let the *Observer* try his hand, and see if he can preach the doctrine of coercion in any country of Europe (except Poland) with that freedom he dares here!

R. I have made it out, if the *convention* has made it out. For the *Observer* (I thank him) has furnished me with the *debates*, which speak as plain as English words can speak, that by *abdication* they did not mean coercion, but a free and voluntary *renouncing*. And he cannot *confute* me, without *confuting* the *convention* too! Now he must see whether the *parliament* will justify me and the *convention*, or the *Observer* against us both.

3. C. He's resolv'd to try, and home too! for he says, "That if the revolution was not founded upon the coercive power, and did not re-assert it; the plain English of it is, That her majesty was then a rebel against her father, is since an usurper, that the protestant succession is founded upon rebellion and usurpation, and that all the revolution-men in Britain and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging, have forfeited their lives; and that there wants nothing but an executioner to tie them up all at once."

R. This is *bold* indeed! It is striking home with a witness! I'm almost afraid while you repeat his words, because they come out of your mouth.

But, Mr. *Observer*, the plain English of it is, that you have run yourself into an outrageous *treason*, or at least a terrible *insolence*; that her majesty must be a rebel and an usurper, and all the *revolution-men* to be ty'd up, if your arguments for coercion will not hold! This was too great a *power* for you to flake, upon all the *wit* in your head!

And I'll appeal to every man in England (but a *cubig*) whether it would not be more honour and security to the *revolution*, if it can be sav'd from being a coercion, than if

it be put upon that foot? Which of these two ways will it look liker a *rebellion*?

4. C. The *Observer* knows that; therefore he wou'd have it *coercion*, that it might be a *rebellion*. For no *revolution* that is not *such* will please a *whig*.

Upon my word, Mr. *Observer*, you have got on the wrong side o' th' *hedge*; my *master* has fairly put the *labouring oar* upon you. You thought you had the *revolution* to fight with against him for *coercion*; and he has turn'd the *revolution* upon you, and brought you to oppose it, and call it a *rebellion*! How came you to be so drawn in?

5. R. I have more to say to him yet. He has made the *queen* a *rebel* against her *father*; (that is, if his beloved *coercion* will not be allow'd) but how do's he make her an *usurper* too? for her *father* was dead before she came to the *crown*.

C. The *Observer* now must try his *wit* to get off, if ever he did it in his life! here's *grief* in one hand, and *sorrow* in the other! For he must either own himself a *blockhead*, to say the *queen* did *usurp* upon her *father* after he was *dead*; or else, he must tell upon whom she did *usurp* — And he must support his *pretender* (whoever it is) against our *act* of *succession*; or else he cannot make the *queen* an *usurper* any manner of way. And will he question the *legality* of our *parliaments*? or say, they cou'd not *limit* the *succession*? or do's he think there can be no lawful *succession*, but what is founded upon *coercion*? I know this is the *succession* the *whigs* love best, pursuant to their old maxim, *The worse title the better king*.

But I'm amaz'd, *master*, what shou'd provoke the *Observer* to vent all this *Treason*!

R. He tells you himself, just before the words I quoted, which he introduces thus, where he says of you,

“ He tells me in his last, that I am *sub-misericordia*,  
“ that is, at the mercy of the law, and there wants no-  
“ thing but execution to make me suffer as a traitor,  
“ for saying, that the revolution was founded upon the  
“ coercive

"coercive power, and re-asserted it. The plain English of which is, that her majesty was then a rebel, &c. as before quoted.

6. C. Here's a consequence indeed! That if he was *sub misericordia*, therefore the queen and all the revolution must come in for a *snack*! He loves good company; they're much oblig'd to him! Let him tell his lords and commons this whom he has the honour to know, and see how they approve of his *modesty*?

But I'll *clinch* the nail faster yet; for you have shew'd, that there is no law in England which asserts coercion! And if none asserts it, then the revolution cou'd not re-assert it. But it did neither assert nor re-assert it. You have provok'd the *Observer* to shew any such act of parliament since the revolution, and he cannot. And till he can do it, he is guilty (by his own confession) of calling the queen a rebel and an usurper.

R. Do not pursue him so close, countryman, you'll make him save somebody a labour.—

7. C. Then I'll go to lesser matters, only his arraignment the government for prosecuting the assertors of coercion, as his worthy predecessor, &c. and he's something afraid of himself. His words are, "Those who write for our fundamental liberties (*that is*, coercion) actually have been prosecuted with vexatious and groundless suits, and are still threaten'd with the like treatment." Is it not perfectly vexatious and groundless to prosecute whigs for asserting their fundamental liberty, to rebel and coerce their kings and queens? And then to think to shelter themselves under the revolution, as if that gave countenance to their principles! And they are stark mad and rave because you have disappointed them, and drove them out of this *asylum* which they thought impregnable!

Wednesday, November 17, 1708. N<sup>o</sup>. 373.

1. How Bays mov'd the *auditory* to *clap* his *play*.
2. The *declaration* against *coercion* in the *act* of *uniformity* being taken away, do's not infer the allowance of *coercion*.
3. The *puffs* of *coercion* fairly hunted down.
4. Three *questions* upon the *statute* 12 Car. II. c. 30. Which being answer'd, I will answer the *Observer's* *captious questions*.
5. The *coronation oath* urg'd by the *Observer* makes against him.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* has got the better of you now, *master*, for, as shew'd in your last, he has threaten'd the *queen* and the whole *revolution*, to bring them all *sub misericordia* (and he has told us what that is) if you will not yield him the point of *coercion*, and you must yield any thing to save all these!

R. This is my *Bays* directly! He stole this from old *Bays*, who to engage the *auditory* to *clap* his *play*, came out in a long black cloak, with an ugly ill-looking fellow behind him, carrying a huge two-handed sword ready drawn, and told the *auditory*, that that fellow would immediately cut off his head, if they did not *clap* his *play*!

C. That fellow's name was *coercion*. And this *Bays* has brought him upon the *stage*, to face the whole *auditory*, *queen*, *revolution*, and all; and to cut off all their *heads*, if they will not say, that he's a *pretty fellow*!

R. He must kill all the *laws* too, before he can secure his point; for I have shew'd how sufficiently they all damn him.

2. C. But the *Observer* says, in his of the 3d instant, Numb. 75. That *declaration* in the *act* of *uniformity*, against *coercive power*, is repeal'd.

R. This

R. This shews him past all *shame*, and that he has nothing to say; for I gave an answer to this in mine of the 10th *March* last: Of which the *Observer* taking no notice, he trump't the *objection* up again in his of the 8th *Sept.* last. To which I answer'd again in mine of the 9th *Oct.* And without any answer to either of these, he now brings it again!

I told him, that he might as well plead the *act* of *uniformity* in favour of the *covenant*, because the time therein specify'd for signing a *declaration* against it, is expir'd. And no otherwise do's it justify *coercion*, to take away the *obligation* of signing the *declaration* against it, and the *penalties* that are annex'd to it. For these need not last for ever. But this alters not the *doctrine*. How often have the *whigs* pleaded, that the 30th of *January* has been kept long enough? And suppose it now taken away, wou'd that infer that the *queen* and *parliament* did justify the *murder* of king *Charles I.*? No more do's taking away that *declaration* justify *coercion*. The most can be made of this, is but a *squint* towards *coercion*; and that too as any one please to think. But where is the law *enacting* it? or *repealing* those *laws* wherein it stands condemn'd for ever? That it never was, or is, or ever ought to be allow'd. As is particularly express'd in the *statute* 12 *Charles II.* c. 30.

3. Is that *statute* *repeal'd*? Come, Mr. *Observer*, speak out. I have shew'd you, that it is now allow'd as good law in *Westminster-hall*. I gave you a fresh instance of it, *Numb.* 363. And *Numb.* 364 the 13th of last month, I told you it never wou'd be *repeal'd*; nay, that it cou'd not be *repeal'd*. And you have said nothing in answer to all this; tho' I told you, that your whole *cause* depended upon it: And that while this *statute* stood, *coercion* must ever stand condemn'd by the law of *England*. Yet you're silent here in — And bounce for all that!

C. It is but as a man bounces in his *saddle*, when he is shot. You'll hear no more of him upon this subject.

*Dead! dead! You may call off your Dogs. The commonwealth puffs of coercion is sub misericordia! fairly run down, she cannot say but she has had bunts-man's-law.*

4. R. *Law! ay, that's it has choak'd her — Mr. Observer, you are very apt to ask questions, and say to me, as in this same Observer, N. 75. Now I demand a plain answer to these plain matters of fact, otherwise I must post him up as a shameless, equivocating, and shuffling libeller, &c. Thus say you to me. Now is it not as fair for me to ask you a question, as you to ask me! Therefore I demand a plain answer to this plain matter of fact; 1. Whether coercion is not absolutely and totally overthrown by the statute 12 Car. II. c. 30. ? 2dly. Whether that statute is not still of force, and the law of the land? And then 3dly. Whether coercion is not contrary to the known and establish'd law of England? These, Sir, are plain questions, and of a very plain matter of fact; and they are necessary to be determin'd in the dispute betwixt you and me. And if you will give me a fair and clear answer to these, I promise to answer all the questions you shall ask me for a week particularly, as to the letter the late king James wrote at Rochester, and his invading Ireland (as you say) with an army; which you bring to justify coercion. Now, Sir, if you will not answer me, I will not answer you; and I may post you, as you threaten me, for a shameless, equivocating, and shuffling libeller. But remember, this is your language, not mine; for I deal not in that commodity. I love a little proving with all my heart: but ill words reflect only upon those that give them. And, we need not suppose the reader so dull, as not to see the block-head and the fool, when he reads the arguments.*

5. C. *He says in the same Observer, That all our kings were expressly sworn to the observation of St. Edward's laws, till the Rehearsal's faction curtail'd the oath, when the late king James was crown'd.*

R. *I know nothing of the curtailling. I never heard of it before. We must take that upon the veracity of the Observer, according to the truth of several other things he has told us!* But

But the *coronation-oath* taken by king *Charles II.* was this. The lord bishop of *London* said to him,

"Sir, will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm to the people of *England*, the laws and customs to them granted by the kings of *England*, your lawful and religious predecessors? And namely the laws, customs and franchises granted to the clergy, by the glorious king *St. Edward* your predecessor, according to the laws of God, the true profession of the gospel established in this kingdom, and agreeing to the prerogative of the kings thereof, and the ancient customs of this realm?"

To which the king answer'd,

*I grant and promise to keep them.*

C. All this makes against the *Observer*. For all that is mention'd of *St. Edward's* laws was the franchises he granted to the clergy. And I suppose the *Observer's* concern is not great to have these kept up to the full! In the next clause there is a limitation as to the laws, &c. here granted by the king, that is, that they be agreeable to the law of God, and to the prerogative of the kings of *England*. And is it their prerogative, that the people shou'd have coercion over them? And is this agreeable to the law of God? you have sufficiently canvass'd that point already. But lastly, our laws are here said to be all granted by our kings. Here is nothing of parliaments, as a co-ordinate power with the king.

Saturday, November. 20, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 374.

1. A raree-show-puss runs away with the *Observer*.
2. He cries for *help*, and can get none!
3. Dr. *Lambert* will not engage against me.
4. He forgot a *punctilio* as to the church of England.
5. Other *protestants* cannot keep their ground against the *papists*, as to *loyalty*.
6. We must first settle *principles*, before we condemn any.
7. The *doctor* and I against both *arbitrary* and *tyrannical*, in the *people* as well as in the *king*.
8. Of the *dispensing-power*, whether in the *king* or in the *people*, and which is worst?
9. The *doctor's* just complaint against scandalous *books* and *papers*, which *blacken* the *revolution*, and justify what is *abjured* in the *oath* of *allegiance*.
10. Every *rebel* is a *pope*.

1. Coun. **T**HE calves-head-club call their common-wealth by the name of old *puss*, and sing anthems to her praise! The *teeth* and *claws* of this *wild-cat* are called *coercion*, with which she tears *kings* and *princes* and *nations* in pieces, and gobbles them up! The *Observer* has bestrid this *monster*, and charged you *furiously*. But my *master* stood upon St. *George's* guard, flapt the *laws* in her face, and she is fled, with the *Observer* upon her back, crying *help! help! lords* and *commons, help!* — *puss* is undone!

2. R. He could find neither *lord* nor *commoner* in all the *convention* who would own this *witch*, all were ashamed of her and turned from her. With what confidence then can he appeal to them now? Does he not think they are as *wise*, and know the *laws* as well now as they did then? They all know that *coercion* is most expressly against all our *laws*. He will get none of them, or any man of *sense*, to *patronize* him in this matter.

3. C. But he thinks he has got a *patron*, and from the pulpit too, Dr. Lambert, who preached at St. James's church, the 23d of October last. Every body there said he pointed directly at you and your *Rehearsals*.

R. I will take nothing that's *ill* to my self, where it is not plainly put upon me; and it may do that gentleman an injury to charge him with what he did not intend. I desire to make no body my enemy, yet I must speak the truth, I find some defects in the performance of that day.

As to what he says of the *Irish massacre* in 1641, I have as great an abhorrence and detestation of it as he can have; let him paint it in as black colours as he pleases.

4. But he is too general in putting the word *protestants* as the opposite to *popery*, especially upon this occasion; because there are those who call themselves *protestants*, that both in principles and practice have been as bloody, perfidious, and rebellious as the *papists* themselves; therefore to prevent the *retortion* (which was so obvious) he might have done the church of England that honour, as to have put her into the scale against the *papists*; for her principles allow of no rebellion, upon any pretence whatsoever; and her laws damn all coercion upon the *Ignorant*.

5. But as for others, who think that the preservation of the *protestant* religion will justify those things, which otherwise would not be justifiable, as *perjury*, rebellion, and slaughter; and yet find fault with the *papists*, for doing the same things, on pretence of the good of mother church; these will never be able to hold their ground against the *papists*, for they make themselves as bad as they! and expose the common Christianity to the derision of the *prophane*!

6. Therefore we must first settle principles, and then find fault with those who deviate from them, whether they be *protestants* or *papists*, else we shall be accused of partiality, and it will be said, that we measure right and wrong by our own convenience, interest, or humour;

while we allow that in our selves which we blame in others.

7. C. He does not forget principles, for he says, *We see the same arbitrary notions, and tyrannical principles now again become fashionable.*

R. 'Tis too true indeed! and the consideration is lamentable! But this affects not me, for I was always against both arbitrary and tyrannical.

I have opposed tyranny in all shapes, especially in that most arbitrary and insupportable, when it is in the hands of the people.

I call that arbitrary which is contrary to the law, and therefore coercion upon the crown is most arbitrary, because it is most contrary to the law. For I am not of those who would let the people be arbitrary, and only the king tied up. I would have both king and people go according to the law; and then we should be happy.

8. C. But may we not dispense with the law a little, upon some extraordinary occasions?

R. We will not allow a dispensing-power in the king upon any occasion; whence then should we have it? If subjects take upon them to dispense with the laws, by their own authority, it is downright rebellion, and a total subversion of all the laws, and ends in lawless confusion; which is far worse than all the dispensing ever we found in any king: for that touches only some particular cases, but the dispensing of the people alters the whole frame of government, and quite overturns the constitution, for it is setting up a different and an opposite authority, it is making all the people kings! and all so many tyrants, bound to no law!

9. C. He says, "It looks as if we were infatuated, and were given up to work out our own destruction, to see the books and papers of those men publicly read and recommended, who have taxed all that were for the late happy revolution, with downright rebellion; and upon whose principles (if true) all must be rebels."

R. Nay more, those men their books and papers have made the revolution a blacker day than the 30th of January.

nuary. Mr. De Foe compares the *dry martyrdom* (as he calls it) of the *son* with the *wet martyrdom* of the *father*, and makes the *dry* a more *wicked* act than the *wet*, as I have shewed in N. 80. 143. And but last Saturday I have quoted the *Observer* bringing in the *queen* by name, and all the *revolution-men* in *Britain* and in *Ireland* too, to be *sub misericordia*, and that they ought to be *tied up all at once!* And this he makes a *demonstration*, if we will not allow of *coercion* and the *deposing-doctrine*, which the *doctor* and all the *clergy* have *abjured* in the oath of *allegiance*, where each one of them said, *And I do further swear, That I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious, and heretical, this damnable doctrine.*

10. C. This was only the *deposing-power* of the *pope*, but not of the *people*.

R. Nay, not only the *pope* is named, but *all other persons whatsoever*; and that the *pope* (let him be as innocent as he would otherwise) could not *authorise* any *foreign prince* to *invade* or *annoy* him (the king) or his *countries*, or to *discharge* any of his *subjects* of their *allegiance* and *obedience* to his *majesty*, or to *give license* or *leave* to any of them to *bear arms*, *raise tumults*, or to *offer any violence* or *hurt* to his *majesty's* royal person, *state* or *government*, or to any of his *majesty's* *subjects* within his *majesty's* *dominions*.

C. That is, the *pope* could not *dispense* with them in this, but they could *dispense* with *themselves!* for every *rebel* is a *pope*, and carries a *dispensing-power* in his own *breast* against all the *laws* of *God* and *man!* so it be for the *publick good!* of which he himself is still *judge!*

Wednesday, November 24, 1708. No. 375.

1. The *deposing-power* better in the *pope* than in the *people*, if in the *people* they gave it to the *pope*.
2. The *people* cannot *re-assume* it, without altering the *constitution*, according to the doctrine of the *whigs*.
3. The *oath of allegiance* *abjures* it, as *impious, heretical, and damnable*, either in *pope* or *people*.
4. Why they *swear* that *oath* to be *administered* by a *lawful authority*.
5. The *whig-past* hanged.
6. The *Observer* calls the due execution of the law (upon a *presbyterian*) *persecution, oppression, jacobitism, popery and arbutism*.
7. But *necessary and just* against those of the *episcopal* persuasion.

Conn. HAVE you any more to say, *master*, as to the *oath of allegiance*, that it is not only against the *deposing-power* in the *pope*, but in the *people* too?

R. I love not to stand alone, especially in ticklish points; therefore I will give you an authority far better than mine, that it were better to be allowed in the *pope*, than in the *people*, though that sounds oddly in *Old England*. But it was wrote in *Scotland* in the year 1673; and you know, that since that time, *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis*. It was thus said then by the professor of divinity at *Glasgow*, in his *Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland*, p. 68, 69. "Less disorder may be apprehended from the pretensions of the *Roman bishops*, than from those maxims that put the power of judging and controuling the magistrate in the people's hands, which opens a door to endless confusions, and indeed sets every private person upon the throne, and introduceth an anarchy, which will never admit of order or remedy; whereas those that have but one

one pretender over them, could more easily deal with him, and more vigorously resist him."

But further, if it were ever in the *people*, it is run from them into the *pope*; for thus says the same excellent person, in his *sermon* upon the 30th of January, 1680, "The resolving all power in the *people* was first taken up by the assertors of the *pope's* deposing-power, for they argued, that if it belonged to the *people*, then the *pope* representing the universal church, all their rights did accrue to him, so that in their names he might dispose of crowns as he pleased."

2. C. Then I find it is as broad as long, for it must come to the *pope* still! And can the *people* (after they turn *protestant*) take their *word* again, and alter the constitution they have once established? Then they may alter every day, and we can have no settled constitution at all! This is what you have often told me, that upon the foot of the *people* there can be no settlement, but perpetual and endless revolutions, as the caprice or humour of the *people*, or the designs of leading-men among them shall blow them into ferment, as winds raise storms in the sea. For which reason you have searched into an higher and fixed rule of government, whose original and obligation is divine; and (I bless God) it has stood the shock of all its enemies, and triumphed over them. A happy day for Britain! and you have made it evident, that this is infinitely more for the good and safety of the *people*, than to have the power left in their own hands; which they never did, or ever can make use of, but to worry and devour one another, as now in Poland. And you have shewed, that the great end for which God did institute government, was to save the *people* out of their own hands. Yet how do some now among us labour to have it placed there again! and may be see not the confusion that would follow! nay, feeling will not do it, where *people* are given up; for you have convinced me, that there is witchcraft in this sin. We see it; Poland is yet fond of the power of the *people*? And our *whigs* are running after it as fast as they can! as they say, men are

are most earnest and cunning, when they are pursuing their own ruin!

3. R. There must be *witchcraft* in it (and of a more than ordinary *size*) if men will still adhere to that doctrine which they have *abjured*, as *impious*, *damnable*, and *heretical*, and which they *swear* to *abhor* and *detest* from their *hearts*! And in this *oath* of *allegiance* they say further, *And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, and swear, according to these express words by me spoken; and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgment, heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God, &c.*

C. Nay more, it is further guarded yet, for it is said, *And I do believe, and in my conscience am resolved, that neither the pope, nor any person whatsoever, hath power to absolve me of this oath, or any part thereof; which I acknowledge by good and full authority to be lawfully administered unto me; and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. These are the words of the oath. But, master, what is the meaning of swearing, that the oath was lawfully administered, and by a good and full authority?*

4. R. Because some men think there is no obligation in an *oath*, that is not lawfully imposed; and it cannot be lawfully imposed, unless it be done by a good and full authority. Otherwise they think it is no more than an *oath* imposed by *highway-men*, all force, and that it obliges only to *repentance*.

C. And by this not only the *pope* his *dispensing-power*, but likewise that of the *people* is *abjured* of any person *whatsoever*; so that I cannot *dispense* with my self from any part of this *oath*. Nothing can be stronger guarded than this; all *starting-holes* are stopt.

R. And can any think, that the *law* which enjoined this *oath*, did allow of that same doctrine (of coercion and *deposing kings*) which it here *abhors*, *detests*, and *abjures*, as *impious*, *heretical*, and *damnable*!

5. C.

5. C. You have *hanged* the *whig-puff* in your former *laws*; and you have kept this last, as a *mill-stone*, to tie about her neck——

R. But, *countryman*, what is become of our *Observer*? he has forsaken my company quite.

6. C. He likes none of your company, *master*. He says you make him mumble *stifles*. He's got into *Ireland*, and is very angry that the *act of uniformity* has laid hold of a *presbyterian* preacher there, who could not keep within his bounds in the *north*, but would needs go and set up a *conventicle* under my *lord primate's* nose, in the very *town* where his *palace* stands. And in his of the 17th instant, *Num. 79*. he calls putting the *law* in execution against this man a *persecution*, and attacking the whole *party*, not only in *Ireland*, but in *Scotland*, and in *Silesia* too, he brings them all into the quarrel; he calls it *oppression*, and putting a note of *bastardy* upon them, and no less than *jacobitism*, *popery*, and *atheism*!

7. R. This is a respectful treatment of the *government* and the *laws*! he would have the *queen* to *dispense* with the *laws*, and stop the execution of the *law* in favour of one single *presbyterian* in *Ireland*, but not to bate an ace, or hinder the violence of the *kirk* in *Scotland* against the whole body of the *episcopal clergy* there, all of whose *meeting-houses* they have shut up, and will not let it be called *persecution*, because it is according to *law*! But more of this next time we meet.

are most earnest and *unning*, when they are pursuing their own ruin!

3. R. There must be *witchcraft* in it (and of a more than ordinary *fixe*) if men will still adhere to that *doctrine* which they have *abjured*, as *impious*, *damnable*, and *heretical*, and which they *swear* to *abhor* and *detest* from their *hearts*! And in this *oath* of *allegiance* they say further, *And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, and swear, according to these express words by me spoken; and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgment, heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God, &c.*

C. Nay more, it is further guarded yet, for it is said, *And I do believe, and in my conscience am resolved, that neither the pope, nor any person whatsoever, hath power to absolve me of this oath, or any part thereof; which I acknowledge by good and full authority to be lawfully administered unto me; and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. These are the words of the oath. But, master, what is the meaning of swearing, that the oath was lawfully administered, and by a good and full authority?*

4. R. Because some men think there is no *obligation* in an *oath*, that is not *lawfully* imposed; and it cannot be *lawfully* imposed, unless it be done by a *good and full authority*. Otherwise they think it is no more than an *oath* imposed by *highway-men*, all *force*, and that it *obliges* only to *repentance*.

C. And by this not only the *pope* his *dispensing-power*, but likewise that of the *people* is *abjured* of any *person whatsoever*; so that I cannot *dispense* with my self from any part of this *oath*. Nothing can be stronger guarded than this; all *starting-holes* are *stopt*.

R. And can any think, that the *law* which enjoined this *oath*, did allow of that same *doctrine* (of *coercion* and *deposing kings*) which it here *abhors*, *detests*, and *abjures*, as *impious*, *heretical*, and *damnable*!

5. C.

5. C. You have *hanged* the *whig-puff* in your former *laws*; and you have kept this last, as a *mill-stone*, to tie about her neck——

R. But, *countryman*, what is become of our *Observer*? he has forsaken my company quite.

6. C. He likes none of your company, *master*. He says you make him mumble *thistles*. He's got into *Ireland*, and is very angry that the *act of uniformity* has laid hold of a *presbyterian* preacher there, who could not keep within his bounds in the *north*, but would needs go and set up a *conventicle* under my *lord primate's* nose, in the very *town* where his *palace* stands. And in his of the 17th instant, *Num. 79*. he calls putting the *law* in execution against this man a *persecution*, and attacking the whole *party*, not only in *Ireland*, but in *Scotland*, and in *Silesia* too, he brings them all into the quarrel; he calls it *oppression*, and putting a note of *bastardy* upon them, and no less than *jacobitism*, *popery*, and *atheism*!

7. R. This is a respectful treatment of the *government* and the *laws*! he would have the *queen* to *dispense* with the *laws*, and stop the execution of the *law* in favour of one single *presbyterian* in *Ireland*, but not to bate an ace, or hinder the violence of the *kirk* in *Scotland* against the whole body of the *episcopal clergy* there, all of whose *meeting-houses* they have shut up, and will not let it be called *persecution*, because it is according to *law*! But more of this next time we meet.

Saturday, November 27, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 376.

1. What is meant by *intruders into churches* in Scotland.
2. And what by the *call of the people*.
3. What by the *legal call*. The *presbyterians* have set up that *Eraastianism*, which they *abjure*.
4. Their zeal for the *call of the people*, in the reign of king Charles II. And since the *revolution*. Which yet they now deny to the *episcopal people*.
5. This shews the *inclinations of the people* to be against them.
6. The *episcopal clergy* in Scotland who *swear and pray* as ill us'd as the rest. They have lately been put in *prison* for not *renouncing their function*: for which there is no *law*.
7. There are more of the *presbyterian preachers* in Scotland who have not taken the *oaths*, than there are of the *episcopal clergy* now alive there.

Y. *Rep.* **T**O pursue the subject where I left off last time, I must explain some *terms* to you, *countryman*; as first what is meant by *intruders into churches*, as it is now us'd with the *presbyterians* in *North-Britain*.

C. Where's the difficulty of that? I suppose it is those *episcopal clergy* there, who being outed by a *law* since the *revolution*, yet will not be content, but *intrude* themselves by force into *churches*, and *thrust out* the *presbyterian ministers* now *establish'd* by *law*.

R. The words do naturally lead to that meaning; and I believe it is so understood generally through *England*. But it is quite another thing, *countryman*. There's nothing of *force* in the case; nor of *thrusting out* any *presbyterian minister*. But there are many *parishes* in Scotland (to use the old word) where the people are for the most part, and some altogether *episcopal*, and not one *presbyterian* among them. These think the *presbyter-*  
rian

rian communion utterly unlawful, as having no true ordination, and therefore that they are no ministers of Christ, but intruders themselves upon their lawful bishops still alive amongst them, against whom they stand out in open schism; which they think no civil law can make not to be schism, or alter the nature of sin. Therefore they cannot in conscience join with them, or receive the sacraments at their hands, which they think they have no authority to administer.

Besides that the holy scriptures are seldom or never read in their publick assemblies. And they have thrown the Lord's prayer, and Glory be to the Father &c. quite out of their worship.

For these reasons, those of the episcopal persuasion there (that they may not be wholly destitute of the worship of God, and partaking of his holy ordinances) call some episcopal clergyman to officiate to them, but without any other way encroaching or intruding upon the presbyterian preachers, or their establishment.

2. C. I have been told, master, that the call of the people is the presbyterian way of filling churches.

R. Yes, countryman, and they have contended for it, as the only lawful way, and pursuant to the institutions of Christ and his apostles.

C. And do they forsake that way now?

R. No, not among themselves, where they are sure of the inclinations of the people; but they will not allow it to other people, to those of the episcopal persuasion. They set up against them the legal call; that is, what is pursuant to the acts of parliament made since the revolution for abolishing of episcopacy, &c.

C. Did not they find fault with this legal call in the times of episcopacy, and when the laws were on that side?

R. Yes, with a loud voice! They called it antichristian, and divesting the people of that liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.

C. It seems then that, by the people, they only meant themselves! The episcopal folks are no people, or have any right to the privileges of the gospel.

3. But,

3. But, *master*, was not this *legal call*, and the *state* intermeddling in the affairs of the *church*, especially in the *putting in* and *putting out* the *clergy*, what the *presbyterians* meant by that word *Erastianism*?

R. Yes, *countryman*, and they have *abjur'd* it by name, even in this *reign*, in both their *provincial synods*, the one in *October*, the other in *November 1702*. Both of which are given us *verbatim* in the *new association*.

C. Strange! To *abjure* what themselves *practise* every day! And the whole foundation upon which *themselves* do stand! For the present *presbyterian establishment* in *Scotland* has no other than a plain *Erastian* foundation. There was not one *spiritual man* in that *parliament* which abolished *episcopacy*.

4. R. They were so zealous for the *call* of the *people*, that they would not allow the *bishop* to *collate*, or the *king* to *present* to any *church*; nay, they would not suffer the *king* so much as to *tolerate* or *indulge* their own *presbyterian preachers*, when the *laws* were against them; to avoid any umbrage of holding from the *king*, or that they needed any help of his authority. For when king *Charles II.* to take away all pretence of their suffering for *conscience*, ordered the *privy-council* in *Scotland* to *indulge* above a *hundred* of their own chief *preachers*, with full *liberty* to them to hear them, they spurned at it; would not *accept* it; and those of their *preachers* who took hold of this *indulgence*, and sheltered themselves under it, they forsook, would not go hear them, and counted them *traitors* of the *rights* of the *church*, called them the *council curates*, and held them in greater *contempt* than the *clergy*, whom they called the *bishops curates*.

And since the *revolution* they have procured an *act* of *parliament* to abolish all *patronages*, or right to *present* to *churches*, as well those in the *crown*, as in private *patrons*; that the *people* might be restored to their *call*; which they think the only true and *evangelical method*.

C. Yet

C. Yet they set up the *legal call* against this, where the *inclinations* of the *people* are *episcopal*.

5. R. It appears now how justly they pretended to the *inclinations* of the *people*; which was the reason given in the *act of parliament* for abolishing of *episcopacy*, because it was contrary to the *inclinations* of the *people*. And yet they now set up that *Erastianism* which they *abjure*, to preserve them from the *inclinations* of the *people*! And they call those *intruders* who come in upon the *call* of the *people*!

6. C. But is there not a pretence against the *episcopal clergy* in *Scotland*, that they have not qualified as to the *government*, by taking the *oaths*? &c.

R. There is no *law* there requiring them that enjoy no *benefices* to do it. They have no *place* or *employment* for which to *qualify*; and it would be *vain-swearing* to *swear* for nothing.

Yet some of them have been so officious as to do it; but they fared never the better for it. Their *meeting-houses* are shut up, as well as the rest, though they both *swore* and *prayed*; for *episcopacy* is the case, and they used the *English liturgy*.

And they were required to renounce their *orders*; that is, to give it under their hands never to exercise any part of their *function* any more, or else go to *prison*; which latter (like *Christian confessors*) they chose, and to *prison* they were sent for this, though I am informed there is no *law* for it.

7. But, *countryman*, I will tell you what is stranger than all this; there are more *presbyterian preachers* now in place, who are upon the *establishment* in *Scotland*, that have not taken the *oaths*, than there are of the *episcopal clergy* now alive in that country.

C. This is strange indeed! Then it is plain, that (as you say) *episcopacy* only is the case; and that must be rooted out, let them *swear* or not *swear*!

Saturday, December 4, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 377.

1. Why no *Rehearsal* last *Wednesday*. The story of *William Bigger*.
2. The *Observer* exhibits his *charge* to the *parliament*.
3. His *charge* retorted, and shewed to be the same method they took with king *Char. I.*
4. The modern meaning of the old word *protestant*. One *presbyterian bigger* than the whole *church of Scotland*.
5. He says the *laws* ought not to be executed, but according to the pleasure of those in *power*.
6. He plays the *union* against the *church of England*.
7. This would have been taken very ill from me.
8. The *church* can take nothing ill.

1. *Res.* **W**HERE were you last *Wednesday*, *coun-*  
tryman? I expected you to have met me  
according to *wont*. Do you think it nothing to disap-  
point so many honest gentlemen, who love to hear you  
and I talk? This will be a prejudice to our paper.

C. It is but an intermitting of the *pulse*—We may  
do well enough for all that, not to make a custom of it.  
I'll tell you, *master*, I went to hear a grave *don* tell a  
story he had to send you by me; he opened his mouth be-  
fore he spoke, and so de—li—be—rate—ly, that though  
it was very short, it kept me so long, that it was too  
late to come to you that night. You will find it in the  
*Observer* of the 17th last month, N. 79. where a ter-  
rible out-ry is made about one *William Bigger* a *presby-*  
*terian—holder—forth* in *Ireland*, who was sent by the  
*northern presbyteries* there to propagate the *gospel*, and set  
up a *presbyterian-meeting* in *Drogheda* upon the *Boyn*, with-  
in twenty miles of *Dublin*, where the lord *primate* had  
his *palace*, and they have had no *dissenting-meeting* there  
these twenty years. This gave so much disturbance to  
the town, that the *grand-jury* did present it, and *William*

was

was committed, pursuant to the *act of uniformity*. But the *Observer* tells us he was released by the *judges*.

R. Well, what have we to do with this? it is in another *kingdom*, and they know their own *laws*. Why do you trouble me with these poor *little stories*?

2. C. Do you think it a *little thing* to be brought before the *parliament*? "I hope (says *Observer* N. 79.) that now our *parliament* is met, an enquiry will be made — And, the case of *Ireland* requires a speedy consideration — It is a direct affront to her majesty" —

R. What! to have the *laws* put in execution?

C. Yes, against *presbyterians*! "That those (says he) who have a legal toleration in *England*, and have the national establishment in *Scotland*, should yet be made subject to prosecution in *Ireland*."

3. R. That is, should be subject to the *laws* in *Ireland*! This makes good what I have always told you, that they will never be content till they have *all*! and the more favours are heaped upon them, does but open their *mouths* to *clamour* for *more*! and they will say they are *ill used* if any thing be denied them!

This is just as they served the *queen's royal grandfather* in *Scotland*. When to please them he had established *presbytery* there, for which he sorely repented in his *Eikon Basiliæ*, and attributed all his after misfortunes as just from God, for this his wicked preferring human *politics* to the *dictates* of a *right informed judgment* (as he himself words it.) And he had granted them every thing that they asked, put those in places whom they named, and turned out those whom they required, and left the *government* wholly in their own hands, till they owned they had no more to ask; and there was such an *union* (as the phrase then went) *A contented king, and a contented people*. And how they praised his *moderation*, and vowed eternal *loyalty*! But the use they made of the power he had given them, was to raise an *army* against him, and follow him into *England*, to have *episcopacy* abolished there too. What! should they who had the national establishment in *Scotland* be made subject to  
pro-

prosecution in *England*, and in *Ireland* too! (Does the *Observer* know his own words?) And because the king and the laws would not consent to them, they overturned both, and by the help of their good brethren in *England* and *Ireland*, they ruined both church and state in all the three kingdoms, and got the whole government into their own hands.

C. Two eggs are not liker than these two cases. They are now going the same track exactly over again! But might not I retort the *Observer's* words more strongly against himself and say, *That they who have (at least) a legal toleration in England, and have (as yet) the national establishment in Ireland, should be made subject to prosecution in Scotland?* And if I should call this a direct affront to her majesty, as the *Observer* does, and tell her her duty, as he does in the following words, that notwithstanding the laws, none of those intrusted with the administration there, should be suffered to persecute protestants.

4. R. Thou dostn't understand thy mother-tongue! the word protestant (in the whig-cant) does not mean the church of *England*; it is not the coffee-house-stile; if thou would'st go there to learn breeding, thou would'st know the use of words! thou wilt not else understand the *Observer*, for by protestants here he means none but the dissenters.

C. I thank you, master, this will open my understanding in many cases. Now I know their meaning of the protestant church and the protestant religion and protestant interest! *William Bigger* was a protestant, therefore the queen ought not to have suffered him to be committed, and though it was according to law, yet it was persecution! But the episcopal clergy in *Scotland* are no protestants, therefore it was no persecution to imprison them, though it was contrary to law!

5. R. This likewise gives us a new notion of law, for we are not to look to the letter, but what will be pleasing above! "I doubt not (says the *Observer*) but his grace (the lord primate of *Ireland*, and now one of the

the lords justices there) knew that our house of lords had put a stop to the proceedings of the high-flying party against protestant dissenters in some of our *West-India* plantations, and therefore might have readily concluded that such proceedings as these, against the presbyterians in *Ireland*, could not be very acceptable to the *British* government, now that the two nations are united."

6. C. Why! is the *presbyterian* interest the stronger for the union? then the *episcopal* must be weaker! This is a healing notion to give us of the union!

But next, as you say, the judges by this are to have no regard to the law, but to what will be acceptable to those in power! See the *whig-patriots* of liberty and property!

Thirdly, the case of *William Bigger* is made the case of all the *presbyterians* in *Ireland*, ay, and in *Scotland* too, and of the *Calvinists* in *Silesia*, for he brings them all in, and asks what they will think of it?

7. But he would take it very ill, if one should say, that the case of all the *bishops* and *clergy* in *Scotland* should be taken notice of by any in the *Christian* world, especially by the church of *England*! And if you should add (as he does in the case of *Bigger*) Now that the two nations are united, he would swear that this was a reflection upon the union, and that you meant to stir up the church of *England* to be jealous of it!

8. R. The *presbyterians* love to hang all together. If you touch the meanest of them, you strike them all to the heart; they are all heart. But the church of *England* is better bred, they do not intermeddle in one another's concerns; they are *individuum vagans*; like cocks of the wood, you may shoot a hundred of them one by one off a tree, the rest only stare at those that fall, but not one offers to stir! They can take nothing ill! you know they never did in their life—Therefore the *Observer* has loaded her like an *ass*, with *passive-obedience* on the one side, and *non-resistance* on the other; couching down like *Issachar* between two burdens, for she saw that rest was good, and bowed her shoulder to bear!

---

Wednesday, December 8, 1708. No. 378.

---

1. The *presbyterians* in *England* deny that any *clergyman* in *Scotland* has his *meeting-house* shut up who *swore* and *pray'd*. And put the *cause* upon it.
2. Some *instances* given to the contrary. They *prosecute* the *people* for having their children *baptiz'd* by *clergy-men*. And turn the *laws* made against the *presbyterians* to be now against *episcopacy*.
3. The *clergy* are required to renounce their *function*, or go to *prison*.
4. The *presbyterian* preachers *balloon* the *magistrates* against the *clergy*.

1. *Coun.* I Have been pay'd off, *master*, for your's of *Saturday* se'nnight, N. 376. Wherein you told me, that those of the *episcopal clergy* in *Scotland* who have *qualify'd* themselves as to the *civil government*, by taking the *oath of allegiance* with the *assurance*, which is there requir'd; and likewise who *pray* for queen *Anne* in exprefs words, are *prosecuted*, and their *meeting-houses* shut up, as well as of those who have done neither. For speaking of this I have been call'd a *lyar*, an abominable *lyar*——They bid me *name, name*, do but *name* any *one*, that has been so us'd, and we will yield all that the grand *lyar* your *master* has said against the honest and moderate *dissenters*; who, if they had the *power*, wou'd (no doubt !) shew all that *lenity*, and *moderation* to the *church of England* (if she were under the *law*, as the *church* in *Scotland* is) that is now shew'd by the *kirk* to those of the *episcopal* *persuasion* there. For they say, God forbid that any shou'd be *persecuted* for meer *conscience* sake, and for worshipping God in that manner they think most agreeable to him! And they boast of the *moderation* of the *kirk* in *Scotland* to the *episcopal clergy* there, and are willing to be measur'd themselves by the carriage of their *brethren*

*thren in Scotland*; therefore they say, That every thing spoken of the *kirk in Scotland* do's affect the *dissenters* here; and that you tell nothing but *lies* of them. And they bid me never believe one word you say more, for that you cannot give one *instance*, of what you have so *maliciously* suggested. Therefore, *master*, if you cannot furnish me with the name of some one *clergyman* in *Scotland*, who has *qualify'd* as you say, and has been us'd as you tell me, I must quit the *coffee-houses*, and shew my face no more in *London*. And I wou'd entreat you, for your own sake, to be very cautious in taking any thing upon trust, for if you are detected in but the *circumstance* of a story, they will make such a *clamour* of it, as if nothing you say were to be believ'd. Therefore I must call upon you, as they do upon me, Come, *name— name— name* but one *clergyman* in *Scotland* so treated as you say— or adieu, *master*, for ever.——

2. R. For the present, name to them, Mr. *Adam Peacock*, Mr. *Patrick Middleton*, and Mr. *Alexander Heriot*. And Mr. *Heriot's* meeting-house in *Musselburgh* is not only *shut up* (though he has *qualified* in all points as I have said) but the *episcopal people* there are *prosecuted* for having their children *baptized* by him.

C. O *strange*! will they not suffer the *episcopal dissenters* there to have their children *baptized* their own way? *Master*, are you sure of this?

R. Here, read that *letter*; it is from one that I can trust; and if it be not true, the *Observer* (you may be sure) will not fail to let us know it. It bears *date* the 13th last *month*, I will give it you in the very words, only explain in a *parenthesis* some *Scots law-terms* are in it.

“ The *meeting-house* of *Stirling*, that of *Cooper* in *Fife*,  
 “ of *Dundee*, of *Perth*, of *Musselburgh*, and *Tranent*,  
 “ and a great many more are shut up and stop'd. But  
 “ that the *clergy* may not be the only objects of this per-  
 “ secution, they turn them against the *people*, and a *pro-*  
 “ *cess* has been intended (that is, *commenced* or *issued*)

“ against some of the people of *Misselburgh* for baptizing their children with Mr. *Heriot*. And the process was tabled (that is prosecuted) before the sheriff of *Louthian*, and the libel founded upon those acts of parliament that condemned the separation from the orthodox and *episcopal* clergy. And indeed this appeared by the debate in open court to be such a perverting of the laws from the true and genuine meaning, and a visible stretch of the law, that the sheriff was forced to desert the dyet (that is, to dismiss the suit) and let the process fall. But they say they will revive it, and insist upon the head. This is a matter of fact, and can be instructed (that is, proved) beyond all contradiction.

C. What! to bring the laws which were for *episcopacy*, to turn now against it!—

4. R. Hold, countryman, I see you begin to be angry—but I will not let you loose yet; take the matter all together, which you will see in *A narrative of the late treatment of the episcopal ministers within the city of Edinburgh since March last, 1708, until their imprisonment, &c.* printed and sold by John Morphew near Stationers-Hall, 1708. There p. 4. 5. you will see the sentence passed by the lord provost and magistrates of Edinburgh against these clergymen the 13th of March last, which prohibits them from preaching or exercising (that is exercising) any part of the ministerial function, in all time coming, under the pain of imprisonment, and to find caution (that is bail) for that effect betwixt this and the 30th of March instant; and in the mean time decreed and ordained their respective meeting-houses to be forthwith shut up, &c. And when they were called upon after the time limited for them to give this bail or security, they were particularly examined whether they had baptized any child since the sentence passed upon them, or exercised any part of their ministry. To which not being able to answer in the negative, they were sent to prison; one of them, who had only preached privately in his own house, pleaded for himself that he prayed for the queen by

by name; but he was told by the lord *provost*, that this was not the question. And though he was not *imprisoned* with the rest, yet the very *Sunday* following he was discharged from preaching in his own house, and hindered by armed *soldiers*.

C. Will you let me go now, *master*? I can hardly hold!

4. R. Bridle your *passion* a little longer, *countryman*, till I *saddle* the right *horse*. See what the same *letter* says:

“ The *presbyterian* preachers are now so bare faced  
“ in their promoting this violence against the *clergy* in  
“ the country, that they have the impudence to *require*  
“ the *justices* of the *peace* and other *magistrates* to exe-  
“ cute the laws against the *episcopal* *clergy*. And this is  
“ so certain a truth that the laird of D—— was a  
“ justice of peace, and the *sheriff* *depute* of *Perth* was  
“ one of the *magistrates*, who were thus treated by  
“ them. For these *preachers* did not do this in their  
“ own names only, but were sent in the name of the  
“ *brethren* by the *presbyteries* and *synods*.

C. They are used to *bully* the *civil* government, and *require* them to do what they think fit. I'm glad you *stopt* me before I told my mind to these *magistrates*; but now I see who *balloos* them on, and consider the power of the *kirk* there, and that these *magistrates* have none to stand by them, if they should shew any mercy to *episcopacy*, I'll turn my *edge* another way; for I have a *question* or two to ask yet, that is, next time.

---

Saturday, Dec. 11, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 379.

---

1. The *meeting-house* at *Leith* shut up by *military force*, notwithstanding the *suspension* by the *lords of the session*. The benefit of the *law* is denied to the *clergy* by the *managers* there.
2. Some of the *clergy* now in *prison*, and since the 18th of *October* last, for not *renouncing* their *function*.
3. Some *questions* in *law* necessary to be resolved.
4. The *persecution* by the *managers* in *Scotland* greater than in *Turkey*.
5. The *presbyterians* will not give *private baptism* in case of death.
6. An *infant* that died in the *church* without *baptism*, because it could not stay out the *sermon*.
7. Their new method of *convincing* men of the small importance of *baptism* by letting them have none.
8. What has been, may be.

Coun. I Told you last time, *master*, I had some *questions* to ask you.

R. Before you begin, I have something more to tell you, to fill up the *case* of the *clergy* in *Scotland*, then you may ask what *questions* you will upon the whole.

1. When the *episcopal meeting-house* at *Leith* was shut up and pad-locked by the *decreet* (that is, the *decree*) of the *sheriff* (pursuant to the *sentence* of the *lord provost* and *bailies* of *Edinburgh*, told you in my last) the *people* there made their application to the *lords of the session* (which is the highest *civil judicatory* now there) against this, as being *illegal* and not warranted by any *law*, and obtained from their *lordships* a *suspension* of this *decreet* of the *sheriff's* till the *cause* should be heard in that court. By which the *people* thought themselves at liberty to make use of the *meeting-house* in the mean time; but to avoid as much as possible all *offence* or *objection* against them, they had a *clergyman* to officiate to them (the  
next

next Sunday, the 17th of October last) who was sufficiently qualified according to law; but he being a stranger, and the hunters not knowing where to find him, they took a summary course to exclude him the next Sunday; for the chief prosecutor there wrote to the commandant of the forces lying at Leith, to appoint a guard to secure the meeting-house there, and to prevent the taking off a new pad-lock that was by his order set on, and thus the people were prevented of any publick worship of God. And lest they might have redress by the ordinary course of the law, he wrote to the under-clerk of the bills for suspensions, requiring him to write upon no bills in favour of meeting-houses, and to intimate to the lords of session, that they should pass no bills till he had a sight of them.

C. This was arbitrary and insulting the law; with the judges, perhaps beyond what the privy council there (so much complained of) ever did. And that court was, as an arbitrary judicatory, dissolved last session of parliament.

2. R. There are three clergymen now in the Tolbooth (that is, the common prison) at Edinburgh, and have lain there since the 18th of October last, because they would not give it under their hands, or promise, not to exercise any part of their function, not for any set time, but, in all time coming, as it is in the sentence against them, which I gave you in the last.

C. I was told they had a *habeas-corpus* act there, as we have here.

R. They have so; but the managers (you see) over-awe the judges, and say they have orders from court.

C. This is according to what you quoted out of the *Observer* last Saturday, N. 17. That the judges ought not to mind the law, but what will be pleasing to those in power.

3. Now, master, the questions I have to ask are these,

1. Whether there is a law requiring them to renounce their function, and promise never to exercise any part of it, in all time coming?

2. Whether there is a *law* to *shut up* and *pad-lock* the *meeting-houses*?

3. Whether a *sentence* of *inferior magistrates*, being *suspended* by the *supreme judicature* of the *nation*, may be *executed* till that *suspension* is taken off?

4. And whether this ought to be done by *military* force?

5. Whether the *manager* has *authority* to require the *clerks* of the *bills* not to write upon any *bill* (which is the method there, and without which I suppose they are not to be received) that are brought in favour of *meeting-houses*? If not, is not this an obstruction of *justice*, and denying the *subject* the benefit of the *law*?

R. The *Observer* in his next will answer all these, and make the *case* as clear as can be!

4. C. If there be not *law* for all this, it is downright *persecution*, and ten times more *severe* than is used against the *Christians* in *Turkey*; for there they may have their children *baptized* by their own *priests*. But in *Scotland* both *priests* and *people* are *prosecuted* for it; nay, if a *priest* there *baptize* his own *child*, it is exercising some *part* of his *function*, and he may be sent to *prison* for it!

5. R. But I'll tell you more, *countryman*, if you were there, and were willing to let your *child* be *baptized* by the *presbyterians*, you could not have it done but upon a *preaching-day*, and brought to *church*, though your *child* were at the point of *death*. They let their own children die without *baptism*, rather than *baptize* them at home. So little they make of *baptism*! or so much of their *preaching* and the outward *church*!

C. And yet they would *prosecute* me, if I sent for a *clergyman* even in that case of *necessity*!

R. Yes, for why should you be so *scrupulous*? You would be called a *high-flyer*, and a man of no *moderation*! and there is no *moderation* to be shewed to such!

6. C. I know the value they have for *baptism* by an instance I have heard which happened since the *revolution*. A *child* was brought to *church* to be *baptized*; and their manner is to *baptize* after *sermon*; but the *child*

was

was so very ill that the parents pressed to have it *baptiz'd* before *sermon*, lest it should *die* in the mean time. No, *Mess John* would not go out of his road, and told them what great matter was it if it should *die*? And the *child* did actually *die* in the church (without baptism) before the long *sermon* was ended. This gave great disturbance to the parents, and made a noise in the neighbourhood. Upon which occasion, to take off the *scandal*, and set their people right in this matter, several of the *presbyterian* preachers through the country took the subject of *baptism* to task, for some months, and instructed their hearers in the non-necessity of *baptism*, and the *superstition* of laying such a stress upon it, as to be concerned for the want of it, however it should happen.

7. R. But they have got a better way of *convincing* now; for first, they themselves will not *baptize* your *child*, but when they're at leisure; and if you make use of a *clergyman*, they will issue *process* against you, and clap him up in *prison*, if they can catch him.

8. C. And this is *liberty of conscience*! this is their *moderation*! and in the now united kingdom, where *episcopacy* is still *established* in the greatest part. But they're afraid of nothing! they think *Issachar* must *bear*! they have tried it before, and why not again, with the same *success*! What has been, may be.

Wednesday, Dec. 15, 1708.

No. 380.

1. The *Observer* is reduced to — *Bellarmino*, thou *lieſt*.
2. Yet he impudently asserts what he cannot prove.
3. He would have the Scots-clergy *preſſ'd* to be *volunteers*.
4. He propoſes a new law to be made againſt them.
5. Which would have ruined the *preſbyterians* in former reigns, and ſtops all their clamours of *persecution* then.
6. Their *reſpects* to queen *Anne*, diſowning her to be their queen, till ſhe roots *epiſcopacy* out of *England* and *Ireland* too.
7. Towards which they now move more violently than ever.
8. The *Observer* would have a *Scotch-kirk* ſet up in *London* by way of *bravery*!
9. As they did at *St. Antholin's* during the *pacification* which king *Charles I.* granted them.
10. But this is needleſs now, becauſe *rebellion* is ſo frequently *preached* elſewhere; and the church will bear all.

1. Coun. **T**HE *Observer* of the firſt inſtant, N. 83. has answered all you have ſaid, *maſter*, concerning the *persecution* of the *managers* in *Scotland*. For he has put it thus in the contents of his paper: *The Rehearſer's falſhood in aſſerting that the epiſcopal clergy in Scotland are perſecuted for their opinion.*

R. He has put it in the contents, that's enough for ſome folks! But there is not a word of it in the paper, except — *Bellarmino*, thou *lieſt*. He ſays I have been detected in ſo many *lies* (but he names none of them) that I am not to be truſted. He calls me a *liar*; I call not him ſo, I only prove it.

2. C. But

2. C. But pray see what he says to his *countryman*, thus it is.

"No doubt, *Roger*, it is a terrible *persecution* in his (the *Rebearser's*) sense, to shut up meeting-houses, where her majesty is never remembered, and where the *pretender* is never forgot, but frequently prayed for under the name of king *James* the VIII. And all the young Clergy of that way, who go to the deprived bishops for orders, are obliged to swear allegiance to him, before they can have the indelible character."

R. A little *proof* here would have done well — For I dare say, he cannot name one of the *meeting-houses* now shut up in *Scotland*, where this is the case. And as little can he *prove* what he so confidently asserts of the *deprived bishops* there. But *blackening* is his business.

3. C. He owns there is no *law* there obliging the *deprived Clergy* to *swear* or *pray*. But he says, *I know no reason why they should not be volunteers in praying for her majesty*.

R. But we do not use to *press* men to be *volunteers*! The way for that is to *oblige* and *encourage* them; but may be he thinks, that to *imprison* the *clergy* will make them do it *voluntarily* and *freely*!

4. C. Therefore he desires the *parliament* of *Great Britain* to make a *law*, That no person shall presume to *preach* to any of her majesty's subjects, without first *owning* her majesty to be *queen de jure*, as well as *de facto*.

R. And they must *swear*, that they do it *willingly* and *freely* too! But we can never be sure of that, where there is an *advantage* on the one hand, if we do it; and a *loss* on the other, if we do it not. But, Mr. *Observer*, the *assurance* in *Scotland* has all in it that you propose, there is *de jure*, as well as *de facto*. And yet Mr. *Heriot* at *Musselburgh* (for example) who has taken this *assurance* (as I have shewed you) is turned out of his *meeting-house*, and the *people* prosecuted for having their *children* baptized by him.

5. C. How would such a law as this have done in king Charles the second's time) (not to name the reign of his father) when the *presbyterians* in Scotland fixed up declarations on the market-crosses of royal boroughs, that he had forfeited his right to the crown, by supporting of *episcopacy* there; and that it was every man's duty to kill him, and all that served him, either in church or state; and pursuant to this, did first murder bishops, and others of the clergy, and killed soldiers travelling the high road, for no other reason but because they saw the king's livery upon their backs; and then broke out into open rebellion twice after one another, first at *Penitland-hill*, and some years after at *Bothwell-bridge*, and fought the king's forces in the open field, and would rather die than say, God save the king, without any *de jure* or *de facto*. And after all this refused the king's indulgence or toleration. No! they would have none of his authority to permit them to preach, though he clogged it with no oaths or conditions whatsoever, but to live quietly and peaceably! And absolutely disdained to observe the 29th of May, or to give God thanks for his restoration. But in their zeal have come in arms, and extinguished the bonfires on that day, declaring him an usurper, &c.

And yet how are we deafened on all hands with the cry of persecution in those days! and that men could not have liberty of conscience to serve God in their own Way! But now the episcopal clergy are persecuted for their opinions! Though no disturbance whatsoever can be charged upon them, or any of them, since the revolution. They only desire to starve quietly, and out of prison, if they can!

6. R. To the treatment the *presbyterians* gave king Charles II. you should not forget to add their respects to queen Anne since her accession, lest people might think their minds are changed. The declaration which 700 of them in arms set up at noon-day on the market-cross of *Sanguair* the 21st of May 1703, is given us *verbatim* in the *West script*, N. 2. of the *Appendix*, wherein they

renounce *Anne* princess of *Denmark* from being their queen, because she had promised to maintain *episcopacy* in *England*; though she gave them all the assurances in the world to support and encourage their kirk in *Scotland*; and they cannot say, but that she has performed it to the utmost, far beyond what I believe even themselves could have expected! Yet they declared, that *England* and *Ireland* must come in too, having been once covenanted-kingdoms; or else, that they would never be at rest, I leave every one to believe them as he pleases.

7. C. The best way to know, is to put it in their power! They think they are not far from it. Therefore move the more violently, as a stone does the nearer it comes to its centre.

R. One push more — and the work is done! They know the church of *England* is for non-resistance; so they will meet with no opposition there!

8. C. In this same *Observer* there is a noble step proposed towards this. He is for pressing forward; he would have the members that are returned from *Scotland* not to be content with the liberty of going to conventicles here (of which he does not pretend there is any scarcity) but to have a place assigned to them on purpose, where they may set up the *presbyterian* way in its purity, as in *Scotland*. He says, One would think they ought to do it merely from a principle of honour and bravery, for which their ancestors have been so much famed.

9. R. He means their ancestors of the covenant, who, when king *Charles I.* granted them a pacification (which you know is near of kin to an union) and suffered their commissioners to come to *London* to treat forsooth! they set up a daily lecture at *St. Antholin's-church* (which in memory of it, has *St. Andrew's cross* on the fane to this day) and continued it from morning till night, being supplied by several bell-weatheres of the covenant one after another, till they poisoned the city with rebellious principles, and fitted it for that use they had to make of it!

10. C. And

10. C. And was not this *brave*! And now the *Observer* preaches the like *bravery* — But he comes too late; for there is nothing but *rebellion* preached in all the *conventicles* in *town* and *country*. They can preach no otherwise; for they have no other *principles*. So that the *Observer's* new *conventicle* would be of no use, only (as he says) to *brave* the *church* of *England*! which will be of little use neither; for she knows how to be *brav'd*, and take it *patiently*! She is *used* to it! This is not the *first* time! and likely will not be the *last*!

---

Saturday, Dec. 18, 1708. No. 381.

---

1. The *Observer* arraigns the whole nation of the Scots as traitors to the government, those especially who are employed by the government.
2. That loyal nation vindicated against him, with the contemptible figure the *presbyterians* there make by his account.
3. He would have all the *episcopal men* in Scotland to be destroyed, which is the body of the nation, as he reckons them, unless he thinks that the *presbyterians* too were for the pretender.
4. His maxim would have hanged the *presbyterians* in former reigns. This shews them their moderation now.
5. The case of *episcopacy* now respects not the civil government at all.
6. The king, parliament, and people cannot make a bishop or a priest. We ought to obey no government in the extirpation of *episcopacy*, but by patient suffering for it.
7. The church has been persecuted by Christian princes, as well as by the heathen. The former the more dangerous of the two.
8. The *presbyterians* have cut down themselves by their own argument, and shewed, that neither their toleration in England, nor establishment in Scotland, takes away their schism.

1. Coun. **D**O you know, master, what countryman this *Observer* is?

R. Why would you know?

C. I am sure he can be no Scotsman.

R. Why so? You see he is a *presbyterian*.

C. No matter for that: The 20th man in Scotland is not a *presbyterian*; but be what they will as to religion, they do not forget that they are Scotsmen, nor love reflections

*flections upon their country.* Now this *Observer* you were last upon of the first *instant*, N. 83. charges them all, as well those that are in the *government*, as those that are out, as a whole *nation of rogues and traitors*; for having told (as quoted in my last) of some body (but he knows not who) that prayed for king *James VIII.* and was not prosecuted for it, he makes this handsome comment upon it.

“Nay then I shall cease to wonder any more at the  
“pretender’s attempt to land there; for he had very  
“good reason to think he would be very welcome to a  
“country, where he was publicly prayed for without  
“controul. Nor shall I trouble my head any more to  
“enquire, why the *Scotch garrisons* were so ill provid-  
“ed, and the *nation* in a posture so unfit to oppose  
“him.”

R. This is indeed *plumb* upon the *nation*, and not any particular men. Or if upon any, it is upon those entrusted in the *government*; for who else should look after the *garrisons*, and to put the *nation* in a posture of defence?

2. But I must speak a word in behalf of that gallant *nation*; for of all the *nobility and gentlemen* (and they were not a few) who were brought up hither and try’d there for this *invasion*, every one of them are acquitted with honour. And if the design was so *general* (as the *Observer* says) even to be *national*, it is strange (and a thing unknown in *England*) that not one should be found to *squeek*, or become an *informer*; either at the time, or since, when they might have had *rewards*, besides the saving of their own *lives*, which lay at the mercy of every one of the rest.

C. There is no reason to be given for it, unless we suppose that not one *presbyterian* was concerned. And if so, what a contemptible figure will the *presbyterians* make (who boast themselves the *majority of the people*) that they should be forgot in a national concern!

R. If the *Observer* be a *Scotsman*, I fancy his *heart* will ache when he reads this, for the *affront* he has put upon

upon his country, and the mischief he intended them by it, to expose them to the resentment of the government, if his word were to be taken.

3. C. He says in the same *Observer*:

“ That if the *episcopal* party in *Scotland* be of such *sedition* principles as still to look upon those as their lawful *bishops*, who are set aside by the authority of the *law*, then it is plain, they fly in the face of *queen* and *parliament*, and are declared *enemies* to the *revolution*, her *majesty*’s title, and the *protestant succession*; which would justify much severer measures than any that have yet been taken against them; for those who disown a government, deserve none of its protection, but to fall under the weight of its resentment.”

4. R. That is to be *hanged* or *steeled* alive; for otherwise what measures can be *severer* than to take from a man all he has in the world, to bar up all methods he can take for his *subsistence*, and to put him into *prison* to *starve* there? If this method had been used in the reigns of king *Charles* I. and II. against those who not only disowned their government, but rose in arms against them, we had been clear of their *din* at this day!

C. Have a care, *master*! He will say you wish they had been all *hanged* then; and then where is your *moderation*?

R. Just where his is, and upon much better grounds, if I had made such a *wish*, which is far from my thoughts; but I would shew these men their *moderation*, by seeing how they would like it in other *people*!

5. C. But how does the *Scots* owning their *bishops* make them *enemies* to the *queen*, the *protestant succession*, &c.

R. It is *ridiculous*! For the *Scots* and all other *episcopal* men ought to do the same, and I hope would do it, under the most uncontested title that ever was. If king *Charles* II. or the late king *James* had done, as has been done in *Scotland*, they would have done the same; the same as the primitive *Christians*, who adhered to their *bishops* under all their persecuting *kings* and *em-  
perors*.

perors. Not by *rebellion* and taking *arms* against their lawful *severigns*, (that doctrine the *presbyterians* learned from the *papists*) but by patient *suffering* for and with their *bishops*, whom *Christ* had set over them by a commission independent of all the *kings* and *parliaments* in the world.

C. He will now call the *Philistines* the *men* of the *Rights* upon you — He will swear you speak *treason*, and affront the *government* and the *protestant succession*!

6. R. And to provoke these *infidels* the more, and to give them all the handle (as they think) of the *law* against me, I do here give it under my hand, and I will maintain it before the *queen* and *parliament* (if they require me) that it is not in their power, and of all the *people* of *Britain* with them, to make a *bishop* or a *priest*. And that if they should destroy all the *bishops* in *Britain* and *Ireland*, and require us to live without *bishops*, I would not obey them, but seek for *bishops* where I could get them; and with them endure all the *persecution* it should please *God* to permit all the *powers* on the earth to lay upon us. *Persecution* is no new thing to the *church*, and under *Christian* princes as well as *heathen*, and often more severe from the *former* than from the *latter*; for the *wounds* of a *friend* are deeper than of an *enemy*.

7. C. And harder to be *cur'd*, and more *insinuating*; because they would make us believe it is all for our *good*, and may *deceive* many, while the *designs* of *professed enemies* are open.

8. But it would provoke *patience* to hear these *presbyterians* now accuse those as *seditions*, who own *bishops* that are set aside by the *law*, when they themselves have all along done it on behalf of their *schismatical* and *traiterous presbyters*; and if their argument is good, then our *presbyterians* are not the less *schismatical* for their being *tolerated* in *England*, or *established* in *Scotland*; because they would not allow it in the case of *episcopacy*, when that was *established*; so that they have pronounced *sentence* against themselves.

Weds.

---

 Wednesday, Dec. 22, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 382.
 

---

1. The *Review* provokes me again; why I left him off.
2. He alledges *scandal* against Mr. *Heriot*. This is the last refuge of the *kirk*.
3. Exemplify'd in the case of Mr. *John Pearson*.
4. The *reputation* of a young *gentlewoman* expos'd by the *presbytery*.
5. Mr. *Pearson* cleared.
6. Yet further *prosecuted*, and no *reparation* made him.
7. He was cited before the *presbytery* the same day his wife was buried.

1. Coun. I Have been asked, *master*, why you say nothing to the *Review*? For he strikes in with the *Observer* as to those affairs in *Scotland* you have been speaking of.

R. The *Observer* has refused his help, and told him that a pillory'd evidence is not good in law; yet now he courts the *Observer* to join with him against me; but his *veracity* is so bankrupt, has been so often and so notoriously detected, especially in his *Experiment*, which he dedicates with so much pomp and assurance to the queen herself, and desires her to take her estimate of the *disfenters* (whose cause he maintains) and of his own worthy worship, by that book, and as every word in it is exactly truth: And since it has been detected, past any possibility of defence, to be all one continued lie, not a chance lie, through inadvertence, or misinformation, but a studied, deliberate, and concerted forgery, stood in and maintained with false oaths, and counterfeit affidavits, and a joint purse to support the most scandalous impostor of the age, in a chargeable suit against the clergy, to blacken them, and render the church odious to the nation: And when all this was made so evident, as  
that

that it could not be denied; yet the *author* in his *Review* (which I have before examined) has not the grace to be *ashamed* or *repent*; but gives still his word, that it is all *truth*, as a full answer to all the *depositions*, *oaths*, and *certificates* by which it has been *detected*, without offering any other *proof* against them. And the party who employed him to write this noble *history*, have now no remedy left, but to buy up this *book*, as they have done, that it is now hardly to be got in any bookseller's shop in town. Thus they have been forced to *eat up* their own *dung*! And their *breath* is so *strong*, that I have quit their company, and their *advocate* so *shameless*, that I have of a long time left off reading his *papers*, supposing them to be rendered so *harmless*, as being *disarmed* of all *credit*, that they could *hurt* no body.

2. C. Yet, *master*, some will believe his *facts*; and you know he wants no *modesty* in *asserting*. I have heard say, (for I have read him no more than you) that he says Mr. *Heriot* of *Musselburg*, whom you instance as a *complying clergyman*, whose *meeting-house* is shut up, was *censured* by the *kirk judicatories* there as guilty of several *immoralities*.

R. That may be when they were his *judges*! But was it for this his *meeting-house* was shut up? I will be at the *penance* to read one *Review* more, and take time to enquire into the *fact*. Till when I will take Mr. *Review's* word no more than about *Abraham Gill*, *Taunton*, *Oakhampton*, *Weather-cock*, &c.

But I will here put in one *caveat* for all, that the proceedings of the *kirk judicatories* against *episcopal clergymen* are not to be taken in *evidence* by any *impartial* man. I think I need not give the reason —

But I will give an *instance* which (if need) will cure any man's *credulity* of the *equality* of their *judgment*.

3. It is the case of Mr. *John Pearson* an *episcopal clergyman*, who had *qualified* as to the *civil government* (all their complaints of *immoralities* are against such) who had a most *scandalous* libel raised against him (last year 1707.) by the *presbytery* of *Dunkeld*, wherein he was charged,

charged, among other things, with no less than eight or ten *adulteries*, though there was no body who *accused* him. But that they might not want information, they summoned about 50 or 60 people (whom they pleased) and made them *swear* whether Mr. Pearson was not guilty of such and such things, particularly of *adultery*, or *attempts of adultery* with such and such women by name. And they made several women *swear* against themselves, whether Mr. Pearson had not been guilty with them? And when they had purged themselves upon *oath*; yet others were examined as to them, whereby their *names* and the *scandal* was made *publick*. They examined one man against his own *wife*, whether Mr. Pearson had not committed *adultery* with her? For which he gave them an *answer* they *deserved*; but I will not here repeat: There are some *broad words* in it, and a hearty *Scotch curse* or two.

4. But there is a young unmarried gentlewoman (whose name is in a *letter* now before me; but I will not set it down, because it is some sort of a *scandal* to be obliged to repel a *scandal*, though the most *innocent* may be subject to it) she is sister to a gentleman who is the *chief* of a *clan* there, and we may suppose in no great favour with the *presbytery*, his *sister* was of an untainted reputation before this; yet they examined all their witnesses against her as to her supposed *adultery* with Mr. Pearson; but never cited herself to appear before them. And though she was acquitted by all the *female* witnesses, as well as the others, none of which could lay the least *scandal* to her charge; yet she is grown melancholy to have her *name* so blown about.

C. This is *intolerable*! They may *blast* any one's reputation at this rate! This is worse than a *popish inquisition*! But I long to know how Mr. Pearson came off.

5. R. So clearly, that not one of all the many witnesses they had by these means summoned in against him could say any thing to his disadvantage, either as to *adultery*, *drunkenness*, or any other of the *crimes* for which they *libelled* him.

C. Then

C. Then how came the *presbytery* off? Were not they *ashamed* and *confounded* for this *unjust* and *malicious prosecution*? And did they not make some *reparation* to Mr. *Pearson* for all this *slander* and *calumny* cast upon him?

6. R. This is not *their* way! The *presbytery* did not, for all this, *acquit* him, nor withdrew their *process*; but referred the matter to the *Synod* of *Perth* and *Stirling*, which met at *Perth* the beginning of *October*, 1707. And this *Synod*, to keep on the *process*, appointed a *committee* of 20 to examine and report to the next *Synod* which was to meet in *April* 1708. But the result of the whole was, that the *Synod* at last let the *prosecution* drop (being *ashamed* of it) but without any *censure* upon the proceedings of the *presbytery* of *Dunkeld*, or *reparation* to Mr. *Pearson*, or others whom they had traduced.

7. There are several particularities in this case worth notice, which I shall not now repeat. I will tell you only one at this time, that the first *citation* given to Mr. *Pearson* to appear before the *presbytery*, was the very day his wife was buried.

C. This was very *humane*! not to say *Christian*! A *cordial* in his *affliction*! That he might not think too much of his *loss*! Was it not *charity* to give him other work to do!

---

Wednesday, December 29, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 383.

---

1. The *scandalous* and *unchristian* manner of the proceedings of the *kirk judicatories* in *Scotland* against the *clergy* there.
2. How much worse than *auricular confession*.
3. They desire a *review* before impartial judges.
4. No *clergy* in *Europe* less *obnoxious*.
5. The *kirk-judicatories* provoked to *justify* themselves.
6. They *explode* the doctrine of *baptism* being a *regenerating ordinance*.
7. *Baptism* is more than a *sign* of *regeneration*, it *conveys* the *thing* it self.
8. The case of *infants* who *die* without *baptism*, and of their *parents*.

1. Coun. **T**HE account of the proceedings against Mr. Pearson by the *presbytery* and *synods* of the *kirk* in *Scotland*, which you told me last time, *master*, I think will never go out of my head; it haunts me day and night. These literally fill up the *character* of the *devil*, to be the *accuser* of the *brethren*, that when no body *accuses* me, all the *country* shall be summoned in to *accuse* me, and to tell upon *oath* all the *miscarriages* they know of me; ay, and of *themselves* too! every man (and woman too) must *accuse* himself, and that upon *oath*! the *husband* be examined as to the *adultery* of the *wife*, and the *wife* of the *husband*! and the *fortune* as well as *reputation* of young *women* blasted, by having their *names* up for *lewdness*——And all this under the mask of *godliness*! and to take away *scandal*! But who can take away the *scandal* they raise? except by shewing that their *tongues* are no *slander*! which these proceedings have sufficiently evinced.

2. R. These are they who cry out upon *auricular confession* made to a *priest* in private, but force men to discover their *secret sins* (and upon *oath* too) before a whole *parish*!

C. That

C. That is only when it is against an *episcopal* man or woman; but especially against the *clergy*. Well, I pity these clergy. This is the severest part of their *persecution*! to have such *enemies* as these, and these their *accusers*, and their *judges*!

3. R. I have seen several letters from *Scotland*, complaining of the grievousness of this *persecution* by the *kirk-judicatories*. And the *episcopal* clergy there would desire no more than a fair re-hearing of these infamous *libels*, raised against them by the *presbyteries*, before just and impartial *judges*; and then more cases would be seen like this of Mr. *Pearson*'s.

C. In the mean time, I'm sure, I shall not believe one word of defamation against any of the *clergy* in *Scotland*, on account of what the *kirk-judicatories* there say or do against them, more than I would believe the accusations of a *lion* against a *lamb* he was going to devour.

4. R. I told you formerly, as I had it from persons of known worth and integrity living in *Scotland*, that there was not any where to be seen, in any church in *Europe*, a more *pious* and *inoffensive* clergy than those in *Scotland* at the beginning of this *revolution*; and how they were first exposed to the fury of the *presbyterian* rabble, and since *persecuted* in various forms; and when all other things were taken from them, their good name and reputation attacked by their inveterate *enemies* who were made their *judges*! that they may truly say, *Was there ever sorrow like my sorrow? Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?*

C. But have you nothing to say to the *Review*? he is upon you over and over again.

5. R. I have nothing to say to him; tell him all the answer I gave you was, *Experiment—Experiment—* Till he clears himself of that, he is not fit for any honest company; and as little credit do I give to his *kirk-judicatories*. I say *Pearson—Pearson—* to them; let them publish the proceedings of the *presbytery* of *Dunkeld* against Mr. *Pearson*. If they will not, somebody else may

may do it for them. I have given but a short abstract of it in my last; let me see if they will *deny* it, or offer to *disprove* it. I rely so much upon my information, that I say they *dare* not do either, lest it bring the truth more fully upon them.

6. C. But the *Review*, the 23d instant, Vol. V. N. 116, has staggered me a little, *master*, upon a very material point; pray answer to that for my satisfaction. He says, p. 463. "The exclamation of this author (speaking of you) seems to be built upon that exploded doctrine of baptism, being a regenerating ordinance." And against this *exploded doctrine* he quotes the 27th *article* of the church of England in these words; "Baptism is a sign of regeneration or new-birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed."

From which he infers thus, *How they will make the sign of the thing pass for the thing it self, remains to be proved.*

7. R. When a covenant is signed and sealed, is it not perfected?

C. Yes, surely. And is not that a sign that it is perfected?

R. Such a sign as is the thing it self; it really conveys what is covenanted. And how foolish would it be to say that parchment, ink, and wax are dead things, and cannot convey? for being the method appointed by law, the conveyance is good, when perfected by him who has power to convey, or his lawful attorney. Such were the apostles, to whom Christ gave the commission, in his name, to baptize, &c. and their successors to the end of the world.

The waters of Jordan did really heal Naaman, not by any virtue in themselves, but as they were a means appointed by God, without which the cure had not been wrought. Thus they were more than a bare sign, they were the means by which it was done.

So the water of baptism is more than a sign, it is the means appointed by which what is covenanted is really conveyed, and puts us in possession of it. This the article calls regeneration or new-birth, and this the *presbyterians* call the exploded doctrine, as Mr. *Review* bears them witness.

C. Then it is no wonder they make so little of it, as you have said, and the *Review* denies it not, that they will let their children die without it, rather than give private baptism, or even in the church, rather than before sermon. So careful they are not to break the orders of the church. O had they been always so!

R. But he asks, who dare say, That the soul of an infant dying without baptism is lost by that mere omission.

R. But the soul of the parent may, if that omission was wilful.

C. He says, This would put it in the parents power to save or damn their infant children.

R. We are not to limit the mercies of God; he is not tied to those rules to which he ties us. But are we not born in sin by virtue of that birth we derive from Adam? and baptism is a new birth into the covenant of Christ. The uncircumcised man child was to be cut off, Gen. xvii. 14. And was not this put in the parents power? And God sought to kill Moses in an inn, upon his journey, because he neglected to circumcise his son, Exod. iv. 24, &c. Yet a *presbyterian* thinks himself safe if he see his child die in his own house without baptism! and their preachers teach them so, and the *Review* defends it.

C. And they are in the right, if baptism is no regenerating ordinance, as they say it is not; for then what great matter is it whether we have it or not? If it be but a sign, it is but a ceremony; and they know how to dispose of ceremonies! they use none with God!

---

Saturday, January 1, 1708. N<sup>o</sup> 384.

---

1. The necessity of *baptism* shewed. Of the *excision*, Gen. xvii. 14.
2. The *presbyterians* think *private baptism* worse than *none*; and that there is no benefit at all in *baptism*.
3. The *kirk* in *Scotland* has no authority to *baptize*.
4. They have no relief from the *reformed churches* abroad.
5. Who may plead a *virtual* consent of *bishops* in their *baptisms*. As also *laymen* who *baptize* in case of *necessity*. The case of *Zipporah*. All *commissions* are *exclusive*. The *kirk* of *Scotland* only has no plea whatsoever.
6. *Baptism* by a *porter* better than by the *moderator* of the *general assembly*.
7. Better *die* without *baptism* than have it from the *erastian kirk*; which has *unchristened Scotland*, were there not a *church*, as well as *kirk* of *Scots*.

1. *Reh.* **T**HIS is the day in which we commemorate the *circumcision* of our Blessed Lord; and we cannot begin the *new-year* better than to consider of that obligation which lies upon us to obey the whole *law* of *God*, from *Christ's* being *circumcised* and *obedient to the law for man*, as our *collect* for this day expresses it.

C. This the *dissenters* call *superstition* in us. What signifies keeping a *day*? it is but a *ceremony*; and they will have no *ceremony* in the worship of *God*.

R. They must whether they will or not, for it is impossible any publick worship can be performed without *ceremonies*.

C. I forgot, they are only against *significant ceremonies*; therefore all theirs are *insignificant*, and signify nothing.

R. It is no wonder they find fault with the *ceremony* of this *day*, when they make the *circumcision* it self of *Christ* but a *ceremony*; for so they make of the institution

of *circumcision*, and of *baptism*, which *Christ* appointed in its room as the *initiating ordinance* whereby men were admitted *members* of his *church*, that is, of his *body*. But if it be only a *sign*, then it is no more than a *ceremony*; but it is likewise a *seal*, which confirms the *covenant* to us, and without which we have no *title* to the *covenant*. How *God* in his *uncovenanted* mercies may deal with such is not now the question. We must not *prescribe* to *God*, though he has *prescribed* to us. But none can *plead* the *covenant*, who are not admitted into it in that *manner* and *form* which *God* has *prescribed*: therefore the *Jews* understood that *excision* mentioned *Gen. xvii. 14.* not only of temporal *death*, but chiefly of being *excluded* from all the *promises* and *privileges* of the *covenant*. And the *text* lays the stress here, that the *uncircumcised man-child* should be *cut off* from his *people*, because he *hath broken my covenant*; therefore was not to be reckoned among the *people* of *God*; nor was he to be admitted to the *passover*, *Exod. xii. 48, 49.* but reckoned as a *stranger*, and not of the children of *Israel*, that is, out of the *covenant*.

C. And yet the blame lay upon the *parents*, which is the absurdity the *Review* thinks does follow from that stress we lay upon *baptism*, and the whole *church* of *Christ*.

2. R. But pray observe how he states the case in the said *Review* of the 23d past, N. 116. p. 463. which he does thus, in behalf of the *presbyterians*; "And now (says he) whether private baptisms are to be commended rather than the publick" — This he makes the case.

C. I can answer that, for this is not one bit or scrap of the case. Our *church* prefers *publick baptism*, and allows of the *private* only in cases of *necessity* where the publick cannot be had. So that the *question* is, whether *private baptism* be better than *none*? The *presbyterians* deny it, and say, that *none* is better, and they practise accordingly. And this shews, that they lay no stress upon it, or think there is any *benefit* at all in it; for who would refuse his *child* what would be *beneficial* to it, especially in *spiritual* concerns?

R. They can never answer that, and therefore it is plain they think no more of it than as a mere ceremony, to make a *shew* with in publick, that they might bear some face of a *Christian* church.

3. C. They had reason to make as little of it as they could, because they knew they were none of their *successors* to whom the *commission* was given, *Go and baptize, &c.* But on the contrary, that they had risen up in *rebellion* (as they still are in *rebellion*) against their lawful *bishops*, who are the *successors* of the *apostles*; and therefore their *baptisms* are not only without the authority of the *bishop*, as when another *layman* (for they are but *laymen*, having no true *ordination*) does *baptize* in case of *necessity*, but in direct *opposition* to the *bishop*; and now in *Scotland* they *persecute* those who dare have their children *baptized* by the *clergy* who have authority for it from their *bishops*. So that their *celebrations* have not the excuse of *Saul* (though he was a *king*, and set up by *God* himself) of extreme *necessity*, and for want of a *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* xiii. 11, 12. but like the *offerings* of *Korah*, in *opposition* to *Aaron*, and so in *rebellion* against the *Lord*.

4. And, as you have before instructed me, they cannot shew the like in any of the reformed churches abroad, where they thus stand out against their own reformed and orthodox *bishops*. They plead *necessity* for their excuse; and whatever there is in that, yet they stand not on the same ground with our *presbyterians* and other *dissenters* here. Let them shew any reformed church that justifies their *separation*. They have been lately condemned from *Geneva*; and I doubt not that these speak the sentiment of all the rest.

5. R. If their *excuse* be real, they may plead the *tacit* or *virtual* consent of the *bishops* in other reformed churches for the validity of their *baptism*; as those *laymen* or *women* do in those churches where *lay-baptism* is allowed in case of *necessity*, they may urge the example of *Zipporah* who *circumcised* her son, *Exod.* iv. 25. But it was by the authority and command of her husband, for *God* sought to kill *Moses* and not *Zipporah* for the neglect  
of

of *circumcising* their son; and *Moses* was then *priest*, it being before the separation of the tribe of *Levi* for the *priesthood*, after which *circumcision* was performed by the *priests*, as it still continues among the *Jews*. Though we read of no such express command given to them to *circumcise*, as that to the *apostles*, *Go ye and baptize*, Matt. xxviii. 19. And all *commissions* being in their own nature *exclusive* of all except those to whom the *commission* is granted, consequently this *commission* can descend to none but to those who are the *successors* of the *apostles*, and those to whom they shall commit it, as the *bishops* do to *priests* and *deacons* at their *ordination*. But this cannot be supposed in those who receive no *ordination* from them; but on the contrary *ordain* one another in *opposition* not only to their own *bishops*, but to all the *bishops* in the world, and abjure *episcopacy* it self, as the *presbyterians* have done in *Scotland*, and make it now a requisite to all whom they *ordain* (as you may see in the *acts* of both their *provincial synods* given us in the *new association*) even in this reign. And they prosecute those as *criminals* who accept of *baptism* from their own *bishops*, or from any *authorized* by them.

6. C. Then I'm sure if I were in *Scotland* my child should die without *baptism*, or be *baptized* by a *porter* or a *midwife*, rather than by the *moderator* of the *general assembly*; for the consent of the *bishop* may be supposed in the one case, upon *necessity*, but cannot any way be supposed in the other. And such *baptisms* are in direct *opposition* to the *institution* of *Christ*, and in *defiance* of it, and of all the *Christian churches* in the world, of the *reformed* (as you have said) as well as of the others.

7. R. And they plead the *laws* of the *land* in their defence! See what a *figure* this *erastian kirk* of *Scotland* makes among all the other *churches* in the world! exploded, condemned, *spewed out* by all, even those whom they plead as their *precedents*! They have, as far as in their power, *unchristened* all the *land*; and better those whom they let die without *baptism*, than those to whom they give it!

6 AP 58

The End of the Fifth VOLUME.